

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
3 SHERMAN DIVISION

4 Case No. 4:21-cv-00033-ALM

5 - - - - -X
6 TIMOTHY JACKSON, :
7 Plaintiff :
8 VS :
9 LAURA WRIGHT, et al., :
10 Defendants :
11 - - - - -X

12
13 Videotaped deposition of DR. PHILIP ADRIAN
14 EWELL taken at the offices of Regus, 157 Church
15 Street, 18th Floor, New Haven, Connecticut, before
16 Clifford Edwards, Certified Shorthand Reporter and
17 Notary Public, in and for the State of Connecticut
18 on September 19, 2024, at 10:09 a.m. EDT.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 2

1 A P P E A R A N C E S:

2 ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF:

3 Michael Thad Allen, Esq.
4 ALLEN LAW, LLC
5 PO Box 404
6 Quaker Hill, Connecticut 06375
7 m.allen@allen-lawfirm.com

6

7 ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS:

8 Benjamin S. Walton, AAG (via Zoom)
9 Mary Quimby, AAG (via Zoom)
10 Office of the Attorney General
11 General Litigation Division
12 State of Texas
13 P.O. Box 12548, Capitol Station
14 Austin, Texas 78711-2548
15 512.463.0447
16 Benjamin.Walton@oag.texas.gov

13

14 ON BEHALF OF THE WITNESS:

15 Richard Painter, Esq.
16 c/o UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
17 318 Mondale Hall
18 229 19th Ave. South
19 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
20 rwpusa18@gmail.com

18

19 ALSO PRESENT:

20 Alejandro Gomez, videographer
21 Timothy Jackson (via Zoom)
22 Cari Jacoby (via Zoom)
23 Renoldo Stowers (via Zoom)

24

25

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

1	EXAMINATION	Page 3
2		PAGE
3	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ALLEN	7
4	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WALTON	244
5	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ALLEN	254
6	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PAINTER	256
7		
8	EXHIBITS	
9		
10	PLAINTIFF'S	PAGE
11	Exhibit 1, Re-Notice of Deposition for	
12	Philip Ewell	7
13	Exhibit 2, Theoria Volume 26, 2020	117
14	Exhibit 3, Article Entitled "Music Theory	
15	and the White Racial Frame" Written	
16	by Philip Ewell, Published in	
17	Music Theory Online	130
18	Exhibit 4, Printout from Society of Music	
19	Theory Website	158
20	Exhibit 5, Article Titled "A UNT Professor	
21	Challenged Claims of Racism in	
22	Music Theory and Now He's Facing	
23	the Music" by Lucinda Breeding	
24	Dated August 2, 2020	164
25		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

1	EXHIBITS	Page 4
2	(continued)	
3		
4	PLAINTIFF'S	PAGE
5		
6	Exhibit 6, Collection of Documents Submitted	
7	by Timothy Jackson to Ad Hoc Panel	
8	Convened at University of	
9	North Texas	179
10	Exhibit 7, Facebook Exchange, One-Page	
11	Document Dated July 25, 2020	191
12	Exhibit 8, Facebook Post by Levi Walls	205
13	Exhibit 9, Document Presented to Ad Hoc	
14	Review Panel	226
15	Exhibit 10, E-mail Exchange Between Philip	
16	Ewell and Rachel Gain	237
17		
18	(Reporter's Note: Exhibits retained by the court	
19	reporter and forwarded to Huseby for production.)	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 5

1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the
2 beginning of media number one in the
3 deposition of Philip Ewell in the matter
4 of Timothy Jackson v. Laura Wright et
5 al., case number 4:21-cv-00033.

6 Today's date is September 19, 2024.
7 The time on the monitor is 10:09 a.m.

8 My name is Alejandro Gomez and I'm
9 the videographer. The court reporter is
10 Cliff Edwards. We are here with Huseby
11 Global Litigation.

12 Counsel, please introduce yourself,
13 after which the court reporter will swear
14 in the witness.

15 MR. ALLEN: My name is Michael Thad
16 Allen, attorney for Timothy Jackson, the
17 plaintiff.

18 MR. PAINTER: My name is Richard
19 Painter and I am attorney for Philip
20 Ewell, the deponent.

21 MR. WALTON: My name is Ben Walton.
22 I'm an attorney for the defendants in the
23 lawsuit.

24 MS. QUIMBY: My name is Mary Quimby.
25 I'm also an attorney for the defendants

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 6

1 in the lawsuit.

2 MS. JACOBY: My name is Cari Jacoby.
3 I'm an attorney for the University of
4 North Texas System.

5 MR. STOWERS: My name is Renaldo
6 Stowers. I'm an attorney for the
7 University of North Texas System.

8
9 PHILIP ADRIAN EWELL
10 residing at 324 77th Street, Apartment 1C, Brooklyn,
11 New York 11209, having first been duly sworn,
12 deposed and testified as follows:

13

14 MR. ALLEN: Professor Ewell, the
15 first thing we are going to do is I'm
16 going to introduce an exhibit.

17 This will happen from time to time
18 during the deposition. There will be
19 documents I'll ask you to examine and
20 I'll ask you questions about them.

21 So I've marked as Exhibit Number 1,
22 which should be in front of you.

23 Do we have the marked
24 Exhibit Number 1?

25 COURT REPORTER: One moment, please.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 7

1 (Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 1,
2 Re-Notice of Deposition for Philip
3 Ewell, was marked for
4 identification.)

5 MR. ALLEN: And I'm sorry, Richard,
6 I brought another copy. This is just the
7 notice of deposition, but the court
8 reporter has written on it.

9 MR. PAINTER: I --

10

11 DIRECT EXAMINATION

12

13 BY MR. ALLEN:

14 Q This is the document -- I'm going to
15 represent to you that this is the re-notice of
16 deposition.

17 Could I ask you to examine the --

18 A Uh-huh.

19 Q -- document?

20 A Get -- get my glasses on here --

21 Q And of course we want you to have your
22 glasses on, too.

23 And this is a good time to bring this up.
24 If at any time you need more time to examine an
25 exhibit --

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 8

1 A Uh-huh.

2 Q -- just say so.

3 A Okay.

4 Q Of course, no one in the room wants you
5 to be answering questions that you haven't examined
6 the exhibit to answer and so forth.

7 A So all the pages here?

8 Q If you could just look it over. I don't
9 have many questions about this one.

10 A Uh-huh.

11 This is a copy of the subpoena that I
12 received; right?

13 Q Well, that was going to be my question:
14 Do you recognize this document as the subpoena and
15 re-notice of your deposition?

16 A I think so, yeah. Yeah.

17 Q And is it accurate to say you've appeared
18 to give testimony today in response to these
19 subpoena -- this subpoena and this re-notice?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And that's the only question I have about
22 that document. You can put it to --

23 A Okay.

24 Q -- the side.

25 At the end of the deposition the court

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 9

1 reporter will take all of the exhibits and will be
2 essentially the keeper of the record.

3 A Got it.

4 Q So I wanted to ask you if you have been
5 deposited before?

6 A No.

7 Q And before the deposition started, your
8 attorney and I were discussing the nature of
9 depositions in your presence.

10 But, again, this is the making of a
11 formal record for the court, so there are several
12 rules of the road we have to abide by precisely
13 because it is a very formal conversation.

14 So in normal conversation, things like
15 you just did to nod or say "uh-huh" or "uh-huh" are
16 perfectly normal and understandable.

17 But for the purposes of creating the
18 record today, I'm going to ask you to answer audibly
19 "yes" or "no," not with partial words or nods of the
20 head to every question; is that clear?

21 A It's clear.

22 And I would like to ask a question of
23 you; may I?

24 Q Absolutely. You may ask me a question at
25 any time.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 10

1 Although, I'm not here to testify

2 obviously, but --

3 A Of course. Of course.

4 If a question that you might want a yes
5 or no is asked and it requires some equivocation,
6 that's okay on my part to give such equivocation.

7 Is that an accurate statement?

8 Q I will leave that to the advice of your
9 counsel.

10 For the purpose of this "deposition" --
11 deposition, I would say you must answer a question
12 "yes" or "no" if there's a yes or no answer.

13 A Yeah.

14 Q If you can't answer it "yes" or "no," you
15 should just simply state that and that would give me
16 an opportunity to ask you why.

17 A Perfect.

18 Q Is there anything that would interfere
19 with your ability to answer questions truthfully
20 today?

21 A No.

22 Q You are not on any drugs?

23 A No.

24 Q You are not suffering from any illness
25 that would affect your memory?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 11

1 A Nope.

2 Q Okay. You also understand the meaning of
3 taking an oath; correct?

4 A Yup.

5 Q And that you are obligated to tell the
6 truth?

7 A Yup.

8 Q As you just did, please ask me if you do
9 not understand a question or you have a question
10 about the question, so to speak.

11 No one has an interest in answering --
12 getting an answer to a question you didn't
13 understand; is that clear?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Likewise, if you don't ask a question for
16 clarification, I'm going to assume that you have
17 understood the question as asked.

18 Is that also clear?

19 A Yup.

20 Q Thank you.

21 Can you explain for the record what you
22 did to prepare for your depos- -- excuse me --
23 deposition today?

24 A I went through personal e-mails from a
25 Gmail account from an old defunct account that I

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 12

1 used to use for professional Gmail,
2 contact@PhilipEwell.com.

3 I went through Facebook direct messages,
4 all pertaining to the subpoena and the questions
5 asked -- may I look here --

6 Q Please.

7 A -- at this document?

8 MR. ALLEN: And I just -- let the
9 record reflect the witness is consulting
10 Exhibit 1.

11 A -- with respect to the documents
12 requested --

13 BY MR. ALLEN:

14 Q Okay.

15 A -- and listed at the end of the
16 subpoena.

17 So I looked for relevant items listed in
18 the documents requested. I, on advice of counsel,
19 put them into a PDF.

20 Q And let me interrupt you.

21 I'm not going to ask you for anything
22 you've discussed with your counsel.

23 A Uh-huh.

24 Q That would be privileged.

25 A Uh-huh.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 13

1 Q The fact that you discussed something
2 with your counsel, that is not necessarily
3 privileged --

4 A Oh.

5 Q -- but the substance, any legal advice,
6 just -- just so it's clear to you --

7 A Understood.

8 Q -- and for the record, I am not going to
9 try to ask questions about that.

10 A Understood.

11 Q And you may hear your attorney object
12 from time to time but --

13 A Understood.

14 Q -- I'm just asking what you did to
15 prepare?

16 If you met with him, that's fine.
17 Obviously --

18 A Uh-huh.

19 Q -- most witnesses do --

20 A Uh-huh.

21 Q -- if they have attorneys.

22 A Uh-huh.

23 Q But -- but please continue. Sorry.

24 A So I put those into a PDF --

25 Q Uh-huh.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 14

1 A -- submitted them to my counsel.

2 Let's see. In preparation, anything
3 else?

4 That would be it.

5 Q And the documents you consulted, were
6 those produced in response to the subpoena?

7 A The PDF document, you are -- you are
8 asking about?

9 Q Uh-huh.

10 A Yes.

11 Q Okay. Were there any documents you
12 consulted which you have not produced in this -- in
13 response to the subpoena?

14 A Not to my knowledge.

15 Q Okay. Did you discuss your upcoming
16 deposition with anyone besides your attorney?

17 A With my wife.

18 Q Which is also privileged, incidentally.
19 So I'm just going to move on.

20 Anyone else besides your wife?

21 A When I first got the subpoena, I
22 discussed it -- I discussed it with the chair of the
23 Department of Music at Hunter College, Mark Spicer,
24 to simply tell him that this had happened. And we
25 had a phone conversation and that is the extent of

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 15

1 that conversation.

2 Q Simply the existence of the subpoena that
3 the deposition would take place?

4 A Exactly.

5 Q Did he give you any advice?

6 A He did not.

7 Q What did he say?

8 A "Thanks for letting me know."

9 Q Okay. That was a little bit of the
10 preliminary necessit- -- necessities for a
11 deposition.

12 I'm going to move on to ask you some
13 questions about the basic background to your career.

14 So could you briefly describe your
15 educational career starting with your undergraduate
16 degree on up through the present?

17 A Yeah, of course. I went to Stanford
18 University undergrad, graduated in 1989 with a
19 degree in music. I'm a cellist.

20 So after that I was accepted to a masters
21 program at Queens College, City University of New
22 York. Moved to New York. That was a two-year
23 program.

24 And I then went to Russia to study cello
25 in St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg Conservatory of

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 16

1 Music. And at that time I was applying to Ph.D.
2 programs and DMA programs as a cellist, so I had a
3 bit of a fork in the road: Will I become a
4 professional cellist; will I become a music
5 academician?

6 I had offers for both DMA programs and
7 Ph.D. programs --

8 Q Can I interrupt you only briefly?

9 Can you state for the record what a DMA
10 is?

11 A Uh-huh. Doctor of Musical Arts.

12 Q Okay.

13 A And that's generally for per- --
14 classical performance people mostly in the United
15 States. It's -- it's a degree that's not really
16 offered in countries other than ours.

17 Q And was there a degree you received from
18 the Conservatory of St. Petersburg?

19 A A certificate.

20 Q How long did it take you to earn the
21 certificate?

22 A I was there for two -- over two years and
23 it was something of the order of a -- of a special
24 certificate for foreign students who'd come to do
25 graduate work but it was really

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 17

1 performance-oriented.

2 Q Uh-huh.

3 A So there wasn't a whole lot of classroom
4 time as part of that certificate.

5 And then I decided ultimately to enroll
6 at Yale University.

7 Q Uh-huh.

8 A That was 1994. And I finished with a
9 Ph.D. in music theory there in 2001.

10 Q Okay. And so when did you return from
11 St. Petersburg?

12 A To start, in 1994.

13 Q Okay. So you were starting in
14 St. Petersburg in 1992?

15 A Not quite. I first went in the summer of
16 '91 --

17 Q Uh-huh.

18 A -- to study language in Leningrad USSR.

19 Q Uh-huh.

20 A I had a program to do language -- to
21 continue language study that fall, but it was not a
22 good program. This was CIEE, if I'm not mistaken,
23 Council on International Educational Exchange.

24 And I ended up coming back to DeKalb,
25 Illinois, which is -- was my hometown.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 18

1 And for the fall of '91, I was in DeKalb
2 and I studied cello and I did some stuff at Northern
3 Illinois University, studied cello with Marc
4 Johnson. He was the cellist of the Vermeer Quartet.
5 And then it was January of '92.

6 That whole fall of '91 I was trying to
7 get back to Russia because I knew I wanted to study
8 cello in Russia. And I was able to -- it wasn't
9 easy because you needed to get visas and it was
10 still kind of a Soviet transitioning -- right -- to
11 post-Soviet.

12 Q Uh-huh.

13 A But I did get a visa and I went back in
14 January of '92 to study at the conservatory in
15 St. Petersburg.

16 Q So you lived along with the Russian
17 people the collapse of the Soviet Union, it sounds
18 like?

19 A Yes, kind of. I -- I was not there in
20 the fall of '91, which is when Leningrad became
21 St. Petersburg. That --

22 Q Uh-huh.

23 A -- was October --

24 Q Uh-huh.

25 A -- when Gor- -- Gorbachev basically went

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 19

1 on air and said, Okay, peace out. I'm done.

2 That was December. That was Christmas

3 Eve --

4 Q Uh-huh.

5 A -- actually of '91 and I was in the
6 States for that.

7 But right after that in January -- first,
8 second week of January, I was back in
9 St. Petersburg.

10 Q Okay. And -- and thank you for that.

11 And I think you said you were from
12 Illinois originally?

13 A Yes.

14 Q DeKalb, Illinois?

15 A Uh-huh.

16 Q Now, after you graduated from Yale with a
17 Ph.D. in music theory, was it?

18 A Uh-huh.

19 Q Can you from that point on briefly
20 describe your professional career?

21 A Yeah. I got a job ultimately at the
22 University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

23 Q Uh-huh?

24 A And from 2002 to 2007, I was an assistant
25 professor of music theory there. Did not go up for

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 20

1 tenure. I left before I did that.

2 I got a job in Naperville, Illinois,
3 North Central College. I was a professor there for
4 two years and wasn't so happy with the professional
5 professorship there.

6 And that's when I went back on the job
7 market. I found a job at Hunter College, City
8 University of New York. And fall of 2009 is when I
9 began that position. And that's the position I
10 still have.

11 Q And did you achieve tenure at Hunter
12 College?

13 A I did.

14 Q What year?

15 A 2016.

16 Q And are you a -- did -- were you promoted
17 after that?

18 A Well, tenure usually happens with
19 promotion from assistant to associate professor, so
20 I was -- I was both promoted and tenured --

21 Q Uh-huh.

22 A -- in 2016.

23 Are you asking if I was promoted from
24 associate to full professor?

25 Q Yes.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 21

1 A And that did happen, yes, in 2021.

2 Q Okay. And that brings us up to the
3 present; correct?

4 A In terms of my rank --

5 Q Yes.

6 A -- and professorship, yes.

7 Q And I'm not interested in what you earn
8 or when you got pay raises or anything like that.

9 But that's -- in terms of your formal
10 titles and your institutional affiliations --

11 A Uh-huh.

12 Q -- that is pretty -- pretty much
13 encapsulates your career?

14 A Yeah.

15 Q Do you have any positions that are held
16 across -- held at other institutions?

17 A No.

18 Q What --

19 A Sorry. I am an affiliate faculty at the
20 graduate center of the City University of New York.

21 Q And just for the record, the City
22 University of New York is also referred to as
23 CUNY --

24 A Uh-huh.

25 Q -- and has many different colleges;

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 22

1 correct?

2 A Yes. CUNY is the way it's generally
3 pronounced.

4 Q And Hunter College is one of those?

5 A Correct.

6 Q Is that generally associated with
7 graduate teaching?

8 A At the graduate center? Yes, that's
9 associated with graduate teaching.

10 Q And when you say, "at the graduate
11 center," is that part of Hunter College or that is
12 the Hunter College?

13 A It is not part of Hunter College. It is
14 part of the City University of New York.

15 Q Okay.

16 A So it is -- the City University of New
17 York is a consortium, I think they might call it, of
18 roughly 24 different institutions.

19 Q Okay.

20 A And Hunter is one of them. There are
21 about six four-year colleges, maybe more. There are
22 two-year colleges, there's a nursing school, school
23 of social work.

24 And the graduate center is generally
25 viewed as the doctoral granting institution within

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 23

1 the City University of New York. They do grants and
2 terminal master's degrees, I think, as well.

3 Q Okay. Do you belong to any academic
4 societies, professional organizations?

5 A I do. Society -- Society of Music Theory
6 and American Musicological Society.

7 Q Any others?

8 A I was a member of the New Directions
9 Cello Association for many years. I think that
10 membership has lapsed.

11 I was a member of -- I might still be a
12 member of the Society for American Music. And I am
13 a member of the Music Theory Society of New York
14 State.

15 Q Okay. That's an independent organization
16 or is it part of the Society for Music Theory, which
17 I believe you mentioned before; did I get that
18 right?

19 A That is cor- -- yes, you got that right.

20 No, it is not a part of the Society of --
21 for Music Theory. It's what we generally call a
22 regional society.

23 Q Okay. I -- I believe it was for the
24 Society -- is it "for" or "of" Music Theory?

25 A I think it's "for Music Theory."

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 24

1 Q So -- and if I say SMT, you'll know I'm
2 referring to the Society for Music Theory?

3 A Correct.

4 Q So I believe it was in 2019 that you gave
5 a plenary talk at the Society for Music Theory;
6 correct?

7 A Correct.

8 Q And the title of that plenary talk was
9 "Music Theory and the White Racial Frame."

10 Did I get that right?

11 A No.

12 Q Can you --

13 A It was --

14 Q Can you --

15 A It was --

16 Q Okay. Can --

17 A It was "Music Theory's White Racial
18 Frame."

19 Q Thank you. Can you, if you remember,
20 tell me the exact date of that talk?

21 A I can't tell you the exact date. I can
22 only say that it was in November of 2019.

23 Q Was it in the beginning of the month, the
24 end of the month?

25 A Well, SMT conferences are generally in

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 25

1 the first or second week of November, so before
2 November 15. I mean, the date is -- we can find it
3 out pretty easily I think.

4 Q Sure. And I also understand the limits
5 of memory. That -- that -- that's fine. It's not
6 about that. I'm trying to place it in time.

7 A Uh-huh.

8 Q And to the best of your knowledge, how
9 was your talk received at the Society for Music
10 Theory in 2019?

11 A It was received very well.

12 Q How were you selected to give the plenary
13 talk?

14 A There was a program committee and they
15 wanted to have a session, I think already entitled
16 "Reframing Music Theory."

17 Q Uh-huh.

18 A The two people on the program committee I
19 remember speaking with at some point were Betsy
20 Marvin and Danny Jenkins.

21 And I think that Joe Straus, my colleague
22 at the CUNY Graduate Center, had suggested my name
23 to them at some point to be part of this
24 multi-person plenary session.

25 MR. ALLEN: I don't --

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 26

1 COURT REPORTER: I can help you.

2 MR. ALLEN: Can we go off the
3 record?

4 I'm sorry, there's a technical
5 issue.

6 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off
7 the record. The time is 10:29.

8 (Whereupon, there was a recess taken
9 from 10:29 a.m. to 10:31 a.m.)

10 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going back
11 on the record. The time is 10:31.

12 BY MR. ALLEN:

13 Q I apologize for the interruption for
14 technical difficulties.

15 I think you were in the middle of
16 answering a question about how you had been selected
17 to give the plenary talk in November of 2019 to the
18 Society for Music Theory?

19 A Right.

20 Q Can you continue with your answer,
21 please?

22 A Yeah. So Joe Straus had suggested me to
23 the program committee and as I mentioned, Betsy
24 Marvin and -- Elizabeth Marvin and Daniel Jenkins
25 were the two names I remember from the program

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 27

1 committee.

2 Q Uh-huh.

3 A And there were four people who gave talks
4 that day and I was one of them. And Betsy Marvin
5 who is Elizabeth Marvin moderated that plenary
6 session.

7 Q And all of the people you just mentioned
8 are members of the SMT; right?

9 A I can't say that they are members now,
10 but they certainly were at that moment. You needed
11 to be a member in order to --

12 Q Uh-huh.

13 A -- present at the conf- -- at the
14 conference.

15 Q What did you submit to this committee or
16 panel for them to evaluate when selecting speakers?

17 A So I had been doing work that resulted in
18 that plenary talk and ultimately in a very long
19 article. The article is titled a little bit
20 different and I wanted the difference between the
21 talk and the article so that there could be a
22 distinction between the two.

23 Q Uh-huh.

24 A You had mentioned "Music Theory and the
25 White Racial Frame."

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 28

1 That in -- in fact is the -- the title of
2 the long article --

3 **Q Uh-huh.**

4 A -- that I had published -- it looks like
5 you have a copy of it there on the -- on the table.
6 And -- and so "Music Theory's White Racial Frame"
7 was the distilled version of that very long paper.

8 I had been doing that work going back to,
9 I would say, 2017, 2018.

10 **Q Uh-huh.**

11 A And I had shown it to some colleagues at
12 CUNY and certainly Joe Straus was one of them.

13 **Q Uh-huh.**

14 A And he thought that this work was
15 important, interesting, so that's why he presented
16 it or suggested to the program committee that I be
17 considered for this -- for this slot.

18 **Q And if you know, approximately how many**
19 **members does the SMT have?**

20 A 1200 is the number that sticks in my head
21 from back then.

22 **Q Uh-huh.**

23 A So plus or minus at this point. Maybe a
24 hundred or two plus or minus 1200.

25 **Q Is it international in scope?**

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 29

1 A The short answer is probably no in the
2 sense that there are international societies.

3 So there's an International Musicological
4 Society --

5 Q Uh-huh.

6 A -- which is clearly international in
7 scope. But the Society for Music Theory certainly
8 has members who are not located in the United States
9 or who are not U.S. citizens, so in that sense it is
10 international.

11 Q Okay. And approximately how long was the
12 talk?

13 A My talk was about -- I -- I think about
14 22 minutes.

15 Q Okay.

16 A My portion of the plenary session was
17 22 minutes.

18 Q And all of these talks, you mentioned I
19 think four in total, they were given at the same
20 time?

21 A Correct. Well, sequentially.

22 Q By that I mean on the same day in the
23 same session?

24 A Correct.

25 Q Okay. And after you had given the talk,

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 30

1 and by your account it was well received, was it
2 available online?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And is it still available online?

5 A As far as I know, no.

6 Q Why has it been removed from its -- where
7 it was online before?

8 A At some point, I removed it myself
9 because I was getting hate mail based on people
10 having viewed the talk.

11 And at some point I contacted I think it
12 was Patricia Hall because the entire session was
13 online and available open, maybe on a YouTube
14 channel --

15 Q Uh-huh.

16 A -- via the SMT website.

17 I contacted Patricia Hall or -- yes, I
18 think it was Patricia Hall as -- and she was the
19 then-president of the Society for Music Theory and I
20 said, Could you please remove my 22 minutes of the
21 talk because people are watching it and sending me
22 hate mail that got quite aggressive, the hate mail.

23 Q Uh-huh.

24 A And -- and she did.

25 Well, the Society for Music Theory did.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 31

1 Not immediately, but -- but in -- in a few days I
2 think that's when the talk was taken down.

3 Q When was this, again?

4 A Oh.

5 Q Within general terms, if you know?

6 A I would say -- well, it was in 2020.

7 That's the --

8 Q That was the time the talk was up online;
9 right?

10 A Yes. It was online after -- after
11 November 2019, you know, maybe -- I -- I don't think
12 it was immediately online --

13 Q Uh-huh.

14 A -- until I had asked her to take it off
15 from the main Society of Music Theory.

16 I should say here that I had clipped my
17 22 minutes and made it available on my own
18 professional website.

19 Q Uh-huh.

20 A And that was easy for me to take down.
21 Since I had put it up, I could take it down.

22 Q Uh-huh.

23 A But the entire session was still
24 available and because of the hate that I was
25 getting, I sent that e-mail to Patricia Hall -- and

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 32

1 it's going to be a ballpark -- in the spring or
2 summer, let's say, of 2020.

3 Q Okay. And who is Patricia Hall?

4 A She was -- was the president of the
5 Society for Music Theory at that time.

6 Q Is she a professor as well?

7 A She's a professor of music theory, yes.

8 Q Where?

9 A University of Michigan, I believe.

10 Q Okay. And you don't have any indication
11 that Timothy Jackson sent you hate mail as -- in
12 response to this, do you?

13 A I do not.

14 Q Or that he organized any of this hate
15 mail?

16 A That -- that I organized it?

17 Q No, my client, Timothy Jackson.

18 A Yeah.

19 Q You don't have any indication that he was
20 organizing some kind of hate mail?

21 A I do not, no.

22 Q Okay. And I think you already answered
23 this, but then a longer article based on this talk
24 was eventually published; right?

25 A Correct.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 33

1 Q And that article was titled "Music Theory
2 and the White Racial Frame."

3 Correct?

4 A Correct.

5 Q And when did that come out?

6 A I think that came out some time in June
7 of 2020.

8 Q And that was published by the Society for
9 Music Theory?

10 A Yes.

11 Q What's the name of their journal?

12 A Well, they have about five official
13 publications --

14 Q Okay. Well, what's the -- what's the
15 name of the journal in which your article --

16 A Music Theory Online.

17 Q Okay. Was it already agreed that the
18 plenary talks would be published as papers in this
19 Music Theory Online journal?

20 A Well, my plenary talk was not published
21 in Music Theory Online. That paper -- that paper,
22 as I've said, is -- oh, gosh -- five, six, seven
23 times longer than my plenary --

24 Q Uh-huh.

25 A -- address.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 34

1 So that's not the same -- the paper --
2 the article that I see printed out over there, that
3 was a separate thing from the plenary.

4 The actual plenary talks were in fact
5 published in Music Theory Spectrum, which is another
6 publication of the Society for Music Theory.

7 **Q Was your -- was your talk in print form**
8 **published in the Spectrum journal?**

9 A Correct. Yes, it was.

10 **Q So before we go onto the longer**
11 **article --**

12 A Uh-huh.

13 **Q -- what was the process for publishing in**
14 **Spectrum?**

15 A I think the editor at that time was
16 Marianne Wheelodon --

17 **Q Uh-huh.**

18 A -- who was a professor of music theory at
19 the University of Texas-Austin. And she -- somebody
20 had gotten in touch with her to publish these four
21 plenary talks --

22 **Q Uh-huh.**

23 A -- as a package. It generally has
24 happened -- I've been told; I've not really seen --
25 I -- I -- I've never been privy to the

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 35

1 conversations -- it's generally happened that
2 plenary talks at the Society for Music Theory are
3 published --

4 Q Uh-huh.

5 A -- in one of those two journals. Those
6 are the main academic journals.

7 But how it actually came to pass, I think
8 that was more Betsy Marvin and probably Joe Straus
9 who were working with Marianne Wheeldon to actually
10 see those plenary talks published in Music Theory
11 Spectrum.

12 Q And I -- just to clarify for the record:
13 Is Spectrum a journal that actually appears in
14 print, like in a hard copy, old fashioned journal
15 print?

16 A I think it no longer does.

17 Q Uh-huh.

18 A It might still -- they might still be
19 burning off print copies.

20 Back then, I think they -- they still
21 were.

22 Q Okay.

23 A But I think it's more or less all online
24 at this point.

25 Q And was that plenary talk when it was

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 36

1 published in Spectrum, was that sent out for peer
2 review before that publication?

3 A I -- I don't know.

4 Q Wouldn't you know as the author that your
5 article was being sent out for -- for peer review?

6 A I -- one would think, yes, but I wasn't
7 that involved. I essentially submitted what I had
8 read at the plenary address --

9 Q Uh-huh.

10 A -- probably -- probably to Marianne
11 Wheelodon. What she did as editor, I do not know.

12 Q Do you remember responding to reviewers?

13 A I do not, no.

14 Q And just for the record, can you describe
15 what peer review means to an academic in music
16 theory?

17 A Yes. Peer review generally happens --
18 it's often called singly-blind or double-blind.

19 Q Uh-huh.

20 A I don't call it that because to use the
21 word "blind" like that is ableist language, which I
22 don't support.

23 I call it single or doubly-anonymous
24 review, as they do in Russia, for example.

25 And a singly-anonymous review is one in

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 37

1 which the reviewers know the identity of the author
2 of the article.

3 And as you I'm sure know, the
4 doubly-anonymous review is one in which all
5 identities are withheld.

6 Q Identities meaning the personal identity
7 of the --

8 A The personal identity of the reviewers --

9 Q Uh-huh.

10 A -- and the author of the article.

11 Q And so to the best of your recollection,
12 there was no double-blind peer review of the
13 Spectrum publication?

14 A I didn't say that I -- I didn't -- that
15 there was no review. I said that I don't know.

16 Q You don't recall ever getting a
17 reviewer's comments?

18 A That's correct.

19 Q You don't recall ever responding to the
20 reviewer's comments?

21 A Yeah, correct. Of course.

22 Q You don't recall ever discussing with the
23 editor peer reviews?

24 A That is correct, yes.

25 Q And certainly, if there was such

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 38

1 correspondence, that would be in your e-mail
2 somewhere?

3 A Correct.

4 Q Or other papers?

5 A Uh-huh.

6 Q Did you do a diligent search of your
7 records for those papers?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Did you turn any up?

10 A Excuse me. Can you repeat that question,
11 please?

12 Q Did you conduct a diligent search of your
13 records for peer review documents of the Spectrum
14 publication?

15 A I am now looking at the documents
16 requested at the end of the subpoena and I really
17 looked at this request number one, two, and three
18 and I don't recall seeing anything about peer review
19 here.

20 So I don't think that I specifically
21 looked for peer review in putting together the --
22 that PDF that I talked about.

23 Q You would agree that a document that
24 discussed peer review of your paper that was
25 presented at the 219 -- 2019, excuse me, plenary

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 39

1 address to the Society for Music Theory would be
2 information concerning your plenary address;
3 correct?

4 A Yes.

5 Q So that would be responsive to the first
6 request there, which asks for each record
7 constituting a communication that implements,
8 mentions, discusses, or contains any information
9 concerning your plenary address at the 2019 Society
10 for Music Theory's annual meeting; correct?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Okay.

13 MR. PAINTER: I'm going to ask for
14 clarification as to what you mean by
15 "record."

16 Are these records in his possession
17 or records in the possession of Hunter
18 College, which have not been produced?

19 MR. ALLEN: We can discuss that off
20 the record.

21 BY MR. ALLEN:

22 Q But I just want to make a record here for
23 the purposes of our deposition that if such a
24 document was in your possession, that it would be
25 responsive to the subpoena; do you agree?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 40

1 A May I ask -- may I confer with my counsel
2 on that?

3 Q You confer with your counsel -- well,
4 let's -- for the purposes --

5 MR. ALLEN: Do you want to just
6 confer here or you want to go off the
7 record so he can confer with you?

8 MR. PAINTER: Well, I mean, it's a
9 legal question as to what's responsive.

10 MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

11 MR. PAINTER: I -- deponents usually
12 consult their counsel as to what is
13 responsive and what is not.

14 MR. ALLEN: Uh-huh.

15 MR. PAINTER: And there are a lot of
16 e-mails that are in the possession --

17 MR. ALLEN: Sure.

18 MR. PAINTER: -- of Hunter
19 College --

20 MR. ALLEN: I understand.

21 MR. PAINTER: -- that have not been
22 produced. And I don't believe he's gone
23 through those in preparation for this
24 deposition.

25 So if you are asking about those, I

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 41

1 think that just needs to be very clear on
2 the record that you are asking about
3 those and then he'd have an opportunity
4 to review those.

5 BY MR. ALLEN:

6 Q And my purpose here is to try to identify
7 whether or not any such documents exist?

8 A Uh-huh.

9 Q If we need to follow up, that's fine with
10 me. I'm not here to try to suggest you did anything
11 wrong.

12 In fact, this often happens in
13 depositions that you identify documents that someone
14 wants, the other person didn't know they should have
15 got, something like that. So it's really not about
16 trying to impugn your reputation.

17 I just want to identify whether any such
18 review of the Spectrum publication happened.

19 So if there are such documents they
20 certainly exist in one of two places, as far as I
21 can tell from what you've discussed so far: They
22 exist either in your own personal records or in the
23 records that are properly in -- in the control of
24 Hunter College; is that correct?

25 A In control of Hunter College, yes.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 42

1 Q Okay.

2 A Yes.

3 Q But as you sit here today, you don't
4 remember seeing any such documents?

5 A Correct.

6 Q Do you remember there being any
7 complaints that publications of these plenary
8 sessions in Spectrum were not peer reviewed?

9 A No.

10 Q Do you have any reason to believe that
11 the Society for Music Theory would not keep such
12 documents themselves if they were generated in the
13 process of peer review?

14 A Can you repeat that question?

15 Q Do you have any reason to believe that
16 the Society for Music Theory would not have these
17 peer review documents related to your article if
18 they existed?

19 A I don't have any reason to believe that,
20 that they would not have them.

21 Q And I guess conversely, would you expect
22 the Society for Music Theory to maintain those
23 records of past peer reviews?

24 A Sure. Yeah.

25 Q Okay.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 43

1 MR. PAINTER: I'd ask you to
2 clarify, are we asking about the article
3 or the talk, the plenary session talk?

4 MR. ALLEN: I am talking about the
5 article that was published in Spectrum --

6 BY MR. ALLEN:

7 Q -- which you said was based on the print
8 that was presented in oral form at the plenary
9 address.

10 A I would say more than based on. I would
11 say it was virtually a verbatim --

12 Q Okay.

13 A -- replication of what I spoke.

14 Q So I want to move on a little bit.

15 Now, you've testified that there was a
16 second paper which grew out of the research and
17 presentation of the plenary talk which was published
18 in Music Theory Online; correct?

19 A Uh-huh.

20 Q Can you describe how that paper came to
21 be published in Music Theory Online?

22 A Yeah. So I mentioned that I began that
23 work probably 2017, 2018.

24 Q Uh-huh.

25 A And strangely, it began as a response to

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 44

1 five articles that were going to appear in Music
2 Theory Online on Kendrick Lamar's album, To Pimp a
3 Butterfly.

4 And there were a lot of things swirling
5 in my head about music theory and how we have dealt
6 with race in the past. And I remember writing a
7 very long -- so I was contacted by Noriko Manabe.
8 She's currently a music theory professor at Indiana
9 University. She was one of the authors.

10 And they said, Would you please write an
11 introduction to these five papers?

12 And I agreed. But the introduction that
13 I originally wrote was very long, 12-, 14,000 words,
14 and it wasn't so much a traditional introduction to
15 five papers on Kendrick Lamar.

16 But I -- I wrote that paper, that
17 introduction, and ultimately I pulled it -- I wrote
18 something completely different, which is available
19 online now, 4,000 words, Hey, this is a great thing.

20 But that original response was the paper
21 that ultimately became "Music Theory and the White
22 Racial Frame." So that I wrote Winter/Spring 2018.

23 **Q Let -- let me ask you a few questions**
24 **about that original -- what did you call it -- a**
25 **response to Kendrick Lamar?**

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 45

1 A It was an introduction --

2 Q Introduction?

3 A -- to five papers on Kendrick Lamar's
4 third studio album.

5 Q I see.

6 A It's called To Pimp a Butterfly.

7 Q And you said that was published or it was
8 not published?

9 A It was.

10 Oh, the original introduction, very
11 long --

12 Q Uh-huh.

13 A -- 12-, 14,000 words, I completely pulled
14 that.

15 Q Uh-huh.

16 A That was not part of it. I rewrote
17 something completely different --

18 Q Uh-huh.

19 A -- which is published as the
20 introduction --

21 Q Okay.

22 A -- to -- to that, I think it's called, "A
23 Symposium on Kendrick Lamar's To Pimp a Butterfly."

24 Q Where -- where was that published?

25 A That was also in Music Theory Online.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 46

1 Q And was that article --

2 A If you --

3 Q -- an introduction --

4 (Whereupon, the court reporter
5 requests clarification.)

6 BY MR. ALLEN:

7 Q So we'll refer to it as "an
8 introduction"?

9 A Uh-huh.

10 Q In its final form, approximately how many
11 words was it?

12 A 4,000 words.

13 Q And 4,000 words in ordinary journal pages
14 would be about how much, in your experience?

15 A I have no idea.

16 Q Was that introduction peer reviewed?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Who were the reviewers?

19 A I do not know. It was -- it was
20 anonymous.

21 Q It stands out in your mind that it was
22 reviewed and you received the reviewers' comments?

23 A Uh-huh.

24 Q And you remember responding to the
25 reviewers' comments?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 47

1 A Uh-huh.

2 Q Okay. Now, that is separate from an
3 article that you eventually published in Music
4 Theory Online called "Music Theory and the White
5 Racial Frame."

6 Correct?

7 A Correct.

8 Q So just focusing on that paper, explain
9 the publication process in that case.

10 A Uh-huh. So I submitted that to Music
11 Theory Online. And it took a fair bit of time for
12 reviews to come back.

13 They came back. They were positive. But
14 the editor at the time, that was Jeff Perry. Jeff
15 Perry is a music theory professor at Louisiana State
16 University.

17 Q Uh-huh.

18 A Does it help for me to say that? Should
19 I be saying that, by the way? I -- you know,
20 because you asked --

21 Q I appreciate it because you have to
22 understand, this is -- this is likely to be or could
23 be shown to a jury --

24 A Yeah, fair.

25 Q -- and they won't know these people from

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 48

1 Adam, nor do I, quite frankly.

2 A Sure.

3 Q So I think it helps to put it in
4 context --

5 A I will --

6 Q -- without belaboring the point.

7 If they become relevant, Professor Ewell,
8 it will be my job to ask about that.

9 A Uh-huh.

10 Q But I do appreciate it when you give
11 these descriptions in brief of who they are and
12 where they are located.

13 So with that said --

14 A Uh-huh.

15 Q -- please continue describing the process
16 of publishing "Music Theory and the White Racial
17 Frame" in Music Theory Online.

18 A Yeah, so the editor at the time was Jeff
19 Perry.

20 Q Uh-huh.

21 A And there was some very interesting
22 back-and-forth. And this is something that I
23 actually outline in a monograph that I wrote --

24 Q Uh-huh.

25 A -- that came out last year. And that

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 49

1 monograph is entitled "On Music Theory and Making
2 Music More Welcoming for Everyone." And I'm happy
3 to -- to -- to repeat some of those things here.

4 So the reviews came back positive as --
5 accept with revisions.

6 Q Uh-huh.

7 A Jeff Perry and the Music Theory Online
8 team e-mailed me, We are going to change this to a
9 different decision.

10 And the decision was revise and resubmit.
11 And that --

12 Q And just for the record -- again, this
13 may be presented to people who have no idea how --

14 A Uh-huh.

15 Q -- the publication in academic journal
16 works, but a revise-and-resubmit recommendation
17 means, if I may summarize, We like it but we want
18 these revisions with these revisions; we'd like to
19 see it again and then it will be published.

20 Is that fair?

21 A Yup, that's fair.

22 Q Okay.

23 A Yeah.

24 Q And so fast forward to the next phase.

25 A Uh-huh.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 50

1 Q What happened next?

2 A Well, since you clarified what revised
3 and resubmit means, we often just say "R&R."

4 Q Which doesn't mean "rest and relaxation."

5 A It does not mean --

6 Q It means more work for the professor?

7 A Yeah, yeah.

8 Oh, let me clarify what "accept with
9 revisions" --

10 Q Uh-huh.

11 A -- at least meant at the time.

12 Q Uh-huh.

13 A It meant this article will be published.

14 Music Theory Online said very clearly at
15 the time in -- in their language, If you get to
16 "accept with revisions," you can consider your
17 article published and you can list it on your CV.

18 Q Uh-huh.

19 A So that's what that meant vis-à-vis the
20 "revise and resubmit" --

21 Q Uh-huh.

22 A -- which is what you just outlined.

23 Q Uh-huh.

24 A They changed the "accept with revisions"
25 to "revise and resubmit."

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 51

1 And I took issue with that. And I began
2 to -- I drafted a memorandum to the chair of the
3 publications committee at the time. That was Brian
4 Alegant, who is now retired I think --

5 Q Uh-huh.

6 A -- from Oberlin as a music theory
7 professor.

8 And I had a phone call with Brian Alegant
9 regarding this case. And ultimately, I emerged
10 victorious in this behind-the-scenes battle, let me
11 say --

12 Q -- uh-huh.

13 A -- as to whether they were going to honor
14 their own rules and not change the goal posts.

15 Q Right.

16 A Right? Or change the goal posts and get
17 away with it.

18 Q Uh-huh.

19 A So it was one of those two things.

20 Frankly, I thought that they would get
21 away with it. But I was a little surprised, happily
22 surprised, when in fact they decided to honor their
23 own rules and publish this article.

24 Q And so the Society for Music Theory
25 honoring their own rules, that's important to you;

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 52

1 correct?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And in this case, you thought they did
4 the right thing?

5 A Yes.

6 I should also add that any society
7 honoring their own rules is important to me.

8 Q And I understand from your statement that
9 you consider yourself a -- basically, an honest
10 academic; right?

11 A I don't understand that question.

12 Q Sure. You want societies to honor their
13 own rules; correct?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Professional societies that address
16 academic work; correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And you, yourself, consider yourself an
19 honorable academic in that sense?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Okay. And this is a perfect example of a
22 question being unclear and you ask for clarification
23 and I appreciate that.

24 A I appreciate the clarification.

25 Q So I want to turn to -- so this article

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 53

1 was peer reviewed. It came back, Accepted but we
2 want a few changes.

3 Then the editorial board, it sounds like,
4 changed that to revise and resubmit; correct so far?

5 A No, it was not the editorial board. It
6 was the editors at Music Theory Online.
7 Specifically, Jeff Perry and probably David
8 Neumeyer --

9 MR. ALLEN: Uh-huh.

10 A -- retired music theory professor,
11 University of Texas-Austin, I think.

12 BY MR. ALLEN:

13 Q Uh-huh. And then you pushed back on
14 that; correct?

15 A Yes. Then I pushed back the editorial --
16 not the editorial board, but the publications
17 committee was the next level.

18 Q Uh-huh.

19 A And this is a publications committee, by
20 the way, of the Society for Music Theory.

21 Q Okay. And you eventually prevailed?

22 A Uh-huh.

23 Q They followed their own rules; right?

24 A Uh-huh.

25 Q And the article was eventually published

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 54

1 after, what I take to be, some few revisions?

2 A Correct.

3 Q So I want to turn now and ask a few
4 questions about the substance of your article.

5 I understand you may not have a verbatim
6 memory of the article and it's been some time,
7 but --

8 A Uh-huh.

9 Q -- I really want you to explain in -- in
10 general terms that can be understand -- -stood by
11 the Jury, if you could, what is the white racial
12 frame in music theory?

13 A Well, the right -- white racial frame is
14 from sociologist Joe Feagin --

15 Q Uh-huh.

16 A -- who's written books called "White
17 Racial Framing," who's talked about this concept
18 from a sociological point of view for decades now.

19 And within -- within music theory, the
20 white racial frame is essentially an acknowledgment
21 that American music theory historically is deeply,
22 deeply rooted in our own country's historic white
23 supremacy.

24 Q So the white racial frame is about the
25 historical background to music theory in the United

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 55

1 States?

2 A Yes, to a very large extent. Yes.

3 Q Okay. And how does the white racial
4 frame justify the great array of privileges and
5 assets held by white Americans?

6 I believe that's a quote from your
7 article?

8 A Can you repeat that again, please?

9 Q Sure. How does the white racial frame in
10 music theory "justify the great array of privileges
11 and assets held by white Americans"?

12 A In music theory -- in American music
13 theory, it's manifested in many, many different ways
14 from the curricula that we put forth in the music
15 theory classroom to the music theorists who have
16 been elevated to study and whose works we read to
17 the performances and the -- the pieces and the
18 repertoire that we tell our students are the most
19 important in -- in their music educations.

20 Q And how does that justify the great array
21 of privileges and assets held by white Americans?

22 A It justifies it in the sense that
23 virtually all of the repertoire, until the last,
24 say, five to ten years, all of the repertoire, all
25 of the theorists, all of the ideas put forth were in

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 56

1 fact created by white men in the history of music
2 theory going back, well, centuries, frankly.

3 And when you look at it from a racialized
4 perspective, as I have, you realize that whiteness
5 plus maleness, the concepts of whiteness plus
6 maleness, in fact give people who happen to be
7 deemed white by society -- because, of course,
8 whiteness as a concept is something that's been
9 very, very flexible over -- over the centuries,
10 since it was created by humans roughly 500 years
11 ago, right -- it gives people who -- who might
12 identify as such a great, great advantage because
13 people by default believe that a person who presents
14 as white and male are -- are more inclined to be
15 like the great music -- so-called great music
16 theorists of the past; right?

17 And it in fact tells our students that
18 this is the model for what music theory should be
19 because quite literally 100 percent of the music
20 theorists we put forth in study were in fact white
21 men, rather than realizing that historically, going
22 back hundreds of years, without question, the
23 country that became known as the United States has
24 valued whiteness over all other forms of races over
25 non-whiteness, let's say.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 57

1 And it's only now that we are beginning
2 to unpack some of the racialized histories of music
3 education and music theory specifically, which is
4 what I do, in order to unpack some of the -- as
5 you -- as you quote from me, the array of
6 privileges --

7 Q Uh-huh.

8 A -- that whiteness and male -- plus
9 maleness -- I'm speaking about whiteness because I
10 think that's where your -- your question is more
11 focused on that.

12 Of course, I very clearly link this to
13 maleness and patriarchy in all of my work because if
14 you actually study race, as I have over many years
15 now, you realize that patriarchy is tied right at
16 the hip to the history of white supremacy.

17 Q Okay. And is this a fair summary -- and
18 I'm not trying to put words in your mouths [sic] --
19 but the fact that only white men have written,
20 published the corpus of music theory up to the
21 present in the United States, that that has propped
22 up white supremacy in the United States?

23 A No, that's not true. I -- I wouldn't say
24 only white men because, in fact, people have
25 theorized music all over the planet since there's

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 58

1 been music; right?

2 We've only put forth a select few in our
3 country because historically, the -- the country
4 that became known as the United States is rooted in
5 two twin ideologies more than any other and those
6 ideologies are white supremacy and patriarchy.

7 Q So these -- these doctrines of white
8 supremacy and patriarchy were responsible for
9 selecting the people in the United States who were
10 considered music theorists?

11 A Well, when you say "responsible for
12 selecting," it almost sounds as if there's, like, a
13 fair egalitarian selection process that's going on
14 behind the scenes.

15 And that's never been the case; right?
16 It's -- it has quite literally been white men
17 writing the rules.

18 It's not like in 1787 when the
19 Constitutional convention was convened in
20 Philadelphia that there were 55 people from all over
21 the country and half of them were women and over
22 here we have the Scots and over here we have the
23 Cherokee and the Hopi.

24 No. No. No. We all know, they were 55
25 white propertied men, about half of whom who owned

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 59

1 slaves, and they wrote a rulebook, the Constitution,
2 which benefited themselves.

3 And to be honest, do you blame them? I
4 wouldn't do -- I -- I would have done the same
5 thing. You had money, you had education, you had
6 travel.

7 I don't blame somebody 240 years ago for
8 writing a rulebook that benefited themselves.
9 That's human nature.

10 This is -- there's not -- there's nothing
11 about blame here.

12 Q And -- and let me ask a question about
13 that specifically.

14 And so in your view, the Constitution
15 itself was written to support white male privilege?

16 A You keep coming back to the word
17 "privilege" and that's not exactly the word I would
18 use.

19 White male supremacy, I would use --

20 Q Okay. Well, let's use your words.

21 It was written to the support white male
22 supremacy?

23 A Not explicitly to support white male
24 supremacy, but it was written with white male
25 supremacy in mind; right. I mean, I, quite

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 60

1 literally, would have been three-fifths of a person
2 because of the Three-Fifths Compromise; right?

3 And --

4 Q And by that, you are referring to the
5 fact that you identify as black?

6 A Correct.

7 Q And people at that time certainly would
8 have identified you as black; right?

9 A Correct. Correct.

10 Q And keep in mind, this will be on video,
11 so we are not making things up and they'll see you;
12 right?

13 A That's great.

14 Q Okay. So then that's what you are
15 referring to?

16 A Absolutely, yeah.

17 Q Uh-huh.

18 A And so I probably would ask a question:
19 How could that not be seen as supporting whiteness
20 if -- if the Fugitive Slave Clause, which was part
21 of the original Constitution, and the Three-Fifths
22 Compromise, which was part of the original
23 Constitution, quite clearly were anti-black in
24 nature?

25 And the first naturalization law from

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 61

1 1790 very clearly said, If you want to be
2 naturalized citizen, you have to be white.

3 Q Uh-huh.

4 A It also said you had to be -- you had to
5 be a free white person, is the way they wrote the
6 law.

7 Well, that's a white supremacist
8 structure; right. That's what --

9 So if -- if you're -- if you're asking me
10 whether the Constitution was written with white
11 supremacy and patriarchy, by the way, in mind, my
12 answer would be unequivocally yes, it was.

13 Q And that includes the First Amendment to
14 the United States Constitution?

15 A The First Amendment of the Constitution
16 to free speech, I think, is one of the high water
17 marks of our Constitution --

18 Q Are you excepting that from the supports
19 of white supremacy in your view?

20 A I --

21 Q Let me rephrase that.

22 A Yeah, yeah, please.

23 Q Are you excepting the First Amendment
24 from the argument you just made about the sup- -- I
25 guess you didn't say "support" --

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 62

1 MR. PAINTER: That

2 mischaracterizes --

3 MR. ALLEN: Yeah, no, I'm trying to
4 get it right.

5 MR. PAINTER: He didn't say the
6 entire Constitution, every provision.

7 MR. ALLEN: Well, let me ask him a
8 question.

9 BY MR. ALLEN:

10 Q I'm asking if you except the First
11 Amendment which guarantees free speech from the
12 argument that you made about the 55, I believe,
13 white men, half of them slave owners, who were
14 advancing white supremacy at the time of the
15 founding?

16 A Yeah. This is a very interesting
17 conversation.

18 I -- I fully acknowledge some of the
19 beautiful parts of the United States Constitution.
20 My personal favorite is the 14th Amendment written
21 by John Bingham, a Radical Republican --

22 Q Which is, of course, after the Civil War;
23 right?

24 A Correct. One of the reconstruction
25 amendments.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 63

1 He was a Congressman from Ohio, a Radical
2 Republican, and a white man, I'd like to point out
3 for the record here.

4 And the First Amendment I think is a
5 great amendment. I think the Second Amendment is an
6 awful amendment, personally, but now we are just
7 getting into speculation and --

8 Q And we don't need to --

9 A -- I --

10 (Whereupon, the court reporter
11 requests clarification.)

12 BY MR. ALLEN:

13 Q Well, I -- I want to -- I don't
14 necessarily want to cut this short, but we have
15 other things to talk about and I -- I just wanted to
16 ask you the question about the first amendment since
17 you had made those statements about the
18 Constitution.

19 I wanted to return to music theory, if
20 you don't mind?

21 A Please.

22 Q What role did music theory have in -- in
23 forming the founders' drafting of the Constitution
24 or the 1790 law that you mention?

25 A What role did music theory have --

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 64

1 Q Yes?

2 A -- in forming the Constitution of the
3 United States?

4 Q Yes. We've been talking about the
5 white --

6 A Uh-huh.

7 Q -- racial frame of music theory; correct?

8 A Yeah.

9 Q And you --

10 MR. PAINTER: Correction. A lot of
11 this has not been about the white racial
12 frame of music theory. We have been
13 talking about the Constitution for at
14 least five minutes.

15 BY MR. ALLEN:

16 Q And then we transitioned to talking about
17 the Constitution when I asked you how did this, for
18 lack of a better word, ideology of the white racial
19 frame justify the great array of privileges and
20 assets held by white Americans; right?

21 A Uh-huh.

22 Q Do you remember that question?

23 A Uh-huh.

24 Q And then we transitioned based on your
25 answer to a discussion of the Constitution and

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 65

1 the -- the law in 1790?

2 A Uh-huh.

3 Q Which I think we all agree is atrocious.

4 A Uh-huh.

5 Q And my question then, returning to white
6 racial framing of music theory, I wanted to know how
7 those are connected. How is the white racial frame
8 in music theory connected to the 55 founders, half
9 of them slave owners, who drafted the Constitution?

10 A Well, that's actually pretty easy to
11 answer. To race scholars like me, it's pretty easy
12 to connect dots to see how the white supremacist
13 foundings of the country are manifested in music.

14 Let's take the New York Philharmonic, for
15 example. I think that's our oldest symphony
16 orchestra. It was founded in 1842.

17 The first non-white person to play and be
18 accepted into the orchestra was 120 years later.
19 His name -- he's a black violinist. His name is
20 Sanford Allen. He's still alive. He lives in New
21 York City.

22 One hundred twenty years it took for them
23 to accept into the orchestra a person who was not
24 white.

25 Since I know a lot about patriarchy and

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 66

1 the his- -- the patriarchal underpinnings of the
2 United States as well, I'll simply point out that
3 the first woman to be accepted to play in the New
4 York Philharmonic, not as just a per service player
5 but someone who is part of the group taken in as a
6 tenured member of the orchestra, that was Steffy
7 Goldner. She was a harpist and that was in 1922.
8 So it took 80 years for them to accept a woman into
9 the orchestra.

10 So if the question is: How did the white
11 supremacist underpinnings of a Constitution or just
12 the founding of the count- -- of the country affect
13 society writ large and, in my case, music and music
14 theory, well, just look at -- look at the New York
15 Philharmonic.

16 Look at the Metropolitan Opera founded in
17 1883. First opera written by a black composer
18 performed in 2021, four -- three years ago. That
19 was Fire Shut up in my Bones by Terence Blanchard, a
20 very fine composer and trumpeter.

21 Q So let me interject for a second.

22 I don't think anyone would seriously
23 question that there has been a racial discrimination
24 in the United States, at least -- not least of which
25 manifested in institutions like philharmonic

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 67

1 orchestras and so forth, just as you have described.

2 A Uh-huh.

3 Q My question was different.

4 My question was: How did music theory
5 inform this white racial frame that you described?
6 How did that inform the -- what you've described as
7 the racial supremacy embedded in the Constitution
8 and other laws dating back to the 18th century?

9 A Uh-huh. Well, I -- I mentioned
10 performing institutions like New York Philharmonic
11 or the Metropolitan Opera.

12 All of the people involved in those, they
13 went to school and they learned music theory; right.
14 It was very much a feedback loop in the world of
15 classical music. It still is to a very large
16 extent, although we are making some very interesting
17 steps forward, I think, in a -- in -- in positive
18 directions.

19 If in fact a student goes to an
20 institution to learn music and they are told
21 explicitly that the -- that white people's brains
22 are bigger because racial phrenologists proved it,
23 if they are told that black people couldn't possibly
24 write good music because they are black, well,
25 that's part of music education.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 68

1 Music theory is a crucial part of music
2 education. It has been, of course.

3 Q So maybe -- let me ask my question
4 another way.

5 Is -- is what you are saying or what you
6 were trying to advance in your article in Music
7 Theory Online that the -- the embedded racial
8 supremacy in our founding documents went on to
9 influence music theory for generations to come?

10 A It influenced absolutely every aspect of
11 American life up to and including music theory.

12 Q Okay.

13 A And it still influences these things
14 today.

15 Q Is it your -- also your argument that
16 this white racial frame in Western music theory has
17 the purpose of upholding white supremacy?

18 A Well, this is the first time you've used
19 the word "Western" and I -- I -- that's not a word I
20 really use anymore. This is something I unpack also
21 in my monograph from last year.

22 The whole concept of the West, it -- it
23 never happened before 1860 roughly. It -- the --
24 the West was created out of thin air.

25 Why? Because Europe could no longer

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 69

1 ignore the money and the power that slave labor had
2 generated in the United States of America. In other
3 words, Europe could no longer ignore the United
4 States of America.

5 So we needed a term to link the United
6 States to Europe. The Europeans needed a term,
7 frankly, and that term was "the West."

8 And that linked up the -- what we now
9 call North America, which is usually considered to
10 be Canada and the United States, despite the fact
11 that North America is a continent that goes down to
12 the Panama-Colombia border; right.

13 So I personally don't use "the West" in
14 talking about some of the structures of -- of -- of
15 music education.

16 And now, I'm sorry, Mr. Allen, you'll
17 have to go back and repeat the -- the original
18 question because --

19 Q Sure.

20 A -- I lost it.

21 Q So let's leave any conceptions of the
22 West since that seems to be something you don't
23 like.

24 So this white --

25 MR. PAINTER: Correction. I -- I

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 70

1 don't think he said he didn't like it.

2 THE WITNESS: You are right. I did

3 not say --

4 BY MR. ALLEN:

5 Q You don't like this term, "Western"? You
6 said it's --

7 A I didn't --

8 Q -- something like it was invented out of
9 think air or something?

10 A Yeah, I didn't say I didn't like it. I
11 said I don't use it.

12 Q Okay. Well, I'm sorry if I interpreted
13 something that you refuse to use as something you
14 don't like, so I stand corrected.

15 Let me ask the question a different way:
16 This white racial frame in Wes- -- let me see --
17 white racial frame in what is contemporary United
18 States music theory has the purpose of upholding
19 white supremacy; is that your argument?

20 A No. No.

21 Q Do you argue that the contemporary white
22 racial frame in classical music theory as it's
23 taught in the United States discriminates against
24 black Americans?

25 A Can you clarify what you mean by

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 71

1 "discriminates against black Americans"?

2 Q Let's start with some of the examples
3 you've used.

4 It denies black Americans access to, say,
5 philharmonic orchestras?

6 A You mean as members playing in the
7 orchestra?

8 Q Sure, let's start with that.

9 A It has, yes.

10 Q As students of music?

11 A I don't understand the question.

12 Q As students in graduate programs in music
13 theory, such as you teach?

14 A Could you give me a full question? I --
15 I --

16 Q Sure. I'm asking how -- or if music
17 theory, as you've described it having this white
18 racial frame, discriminates against black Americans,
19 and you asked me to be more specific.

20 A I asked you to -- to -- to explain what
21 you mean by "discriminating black Americans," yes.

22 Q And I said it keeps black Americans out
23 of positions as performing artists in philharmonic
24 orchestras, and you agreed?

25 A Yeah.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 72

1 Q And I asked if it keeps black Americans
2 out of music theory education programs, such as the
3 one you teach.

4 So let's then move onto that question.

5 A Are you --

6 Q Is that an argument you would make, that
7 this white racial frame discriminates against black
8 Americans by keeping them out of music theory
9 programs?

10 A I don't understand what you mean by
11 "keeping out of."

12 You mean like not being admitted to
13 study.

14 Q Sure. It excludes them?

15 A It excludes them as undergraduates or as
16 masters or doctoral students?

17 Q Let's take them in turn. As
18 undergraduates?

19 Do you know of any undergraduates who are
20 black Americans who wanted to study in music theory
21 who were excluded from a program in the United
22 States because of the white racial frame of music
23 theory?

24 A Well, so I 00 I often refer to history in
25 these terms and now I would refer to Paul Brent, who

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 73

1 is the first black student to study at Peabody.
2 That was 1949. He was most certainly excluded
3 because of his blackness but he did ultimately get
4 in before that.

5 It was quite routine to exclude black
6 people from conservatories and from music education
7 because -- quite explicitly because of their
8 blackness.

9 Carl Seashore was a music theorist at the
10 University of Iowa who died years ago. He was
11 essentially a musical eugenicist and he is -- his
12 goal was to prove the inferiority of black musicians
13 in the country.

14 The reason I'm laying out the history
15 here is because it sounds like you want me to answer
16 something about today and I have a hard time
17 answering such a question without laying out a
18 little bit of --

19 Q Sure.

20 A -- the history as to exactly how and why
21 blacks were in fact discriminated against in music
22 educational settings in horrific ways, I might add,
23 going back to the 19th century.

24 But Paul Brent was 1949. That's not that
25 old. My folks were alive in 1949. That's not that

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 74

1 far in -- into the past.

2 And it's not that much of a leap to think
3 that such discrimination could have happened in the
4 late 20th century.

5 Now, if you are asking me if I know
6 specifically, I'd have to think. I could probably
7 come up with some instances where it actually has
8 been part of the "do you get admitted or do you not
9 get admitted" --

10 Q Uh-huh.

11 A -- "into this program as an
12 undergraduate, as a masters student, as a doctoral
13 student?"

14 Q So this is still happening today is -- is
15 what you believe?

16 A If the question is racial discrimination
17 is still happening --

18 Q No, that --

19 A -- in music --

20 Q -- wasn't my question.

21 Are students being excluded from
22 undergraduate programs because they are black today?

23 A In undergraduate music programs?

24 I think that it -- not explicitly, but in
25 fact implicitly yes, probably yes.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 75

1 MR. PAINTER: Take a break fairly
2 soon?

3 MR. ALLEN: You want a break?

4 MR. PAINTER: Yeah, pretty soon.

5 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay.

6 MR. PAINTER: Brief break.

7 MR. ALLEN: Let's go off the record
8 and take a break now. It's fine. It's
9 11:18.

10 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off
11 the record.

12 MR. PAINTER: Just go to the
13 bathroom.

14 MR. ALLEN: Yeah, sure.

15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
16 11:18.

17 (Whereupon, there was a recess taken
18 from 11:18 a.m. to 11:31 a.m.)

19 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going back
20 on the record. The time is 11:31.

21 BY MR. ALLEN:

22 Q Professor Ewell, I believe before our
23 short break you were talking about -- we were
24 answering questions about specific incidents of
25 discrimination in the field of music theory and the

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 76

1 admission to undergraduate. You had also mentioned
2 graduate schools.

3 So I want to continue with that line of
4 questioning, if you don't mind.

5 Do you know of any black students who
6 have been denied admission to the University of
7 North Texas graduate program in music theory?

8 A Nope.

9 Q Do you know of any specific incident in
10 which my client, Timothy Jackson, has discriminated
11 against a black American?

12 A No.

13 Q Any black person, whether American or
14 not?

15 A No.

16 Q While we are at it, do you know of any
17 racist actions committed by my client?

18 A No.

19 I would ask, I guess, just to define
20 "racist" because I -- could you define what you mean
21 by "racist" as --

22 Q Well, this is something he's accused of,
23 so I don't know how graduate students or faculty at
24 the University of North Texas define that. Maybe
25 you could illuminate.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 77

1 Do you -- you know the fac- -- you know
2 some of the faculty at the University of North Texas
3 in their school of music; right?

4 A Yeah, a couple. The one that I knew best
5 was Ellen Bakulina.

6 Q Uh-huh.

7 A She's also a Russianist --

8 Q Uh-huh.

9 A -- as am I -- who's no longer there.

10 Q Uh-huh. Do you know what she means by
11 "racism"?

12 A And she's now associate professor of
13 music theory at McGill University.

14 Sorry, could you repeat that?

15 Q Do you know what Ellen Bakulina means by
16 racist?

17 A No.

18 Q Okay. So back to the -- to questions
19 about the white racial frame in music theory, as
20 you've described it in your article, how has the
21 white racial frame in music theory impeded your
22 career personally?

23 A I -- before I answer that I just want to
24 once again highlight -- because you've said "white
25 racial frame" quite a bit, that's not my -- I didn't

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 78

1 come up with this -- this phraseology.

2 It's Joe Feagin who just retired from
3 Texas A&M University as a sociologist. He's
4 85 years old. He's an American icon, as a matter of
5 fact.

6 And so I really have to just kind of say,
7 I didn't come up with white racial framing. That's
8 Joe Feagin. He's written many books on this topic.

9 And, you know, so part of me wants to
10 say, We should be reading his work because he's the
11 expert on white racial framing.

12 And I'm sorry, could you please repeat
13 the question about the white racial frame of music
14 theory?

15 Q Well, by mentioning Joe Feagin you are
16 not suggesting that your articles weren't developing
17 the idea of the white racial frame as it applied to
18 music theory taught in the United States; right?

19 A No, they were very much --

20 Q Okay.

21 A -- using his ideas, yes.

22 Q Okay. And I understand -- I think you
23 would -- we all would agree that scholars build on
24 the scholarship of others; correct?

25 A Yes.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 79

1 Q I'm most interested in the ideas that
2 you've developed --

3 A Uh-huh.

4 Q -- defining, elaborating, identifying the
5 white racial frame in music theory as it's taught in
6 the United States; is that fair?

7 A Fair, yes.

8 Q And you've written on that in your
9 article that grew out of your plenary talk in
10 2019 --

11 A Uh-huh.

12 Q -- and it was eventually -- and please
13 say "yes" or "no."

14 Yes?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And that was eventually published in your
17 article in Music Theory Online; correct?

18 A Yeah. Yes.

19 Q And in fact it has "white racial frame"
20 in the title; correct?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Okay. So that's what I'm talking about;
23 is -- can we agree on that?

24 A Yes.

25 Q All right. I'm asking: How did the

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 80

1 white racial frame in American music theory as
2 you've described it impede your career as a black
3 American man?

4 A Oh, that's a vast, vast question.

5 The first part I would say, it's hard for
6 me to even know because much of anti-black -- much
7 of anti-blackness happens behind the scenes. So
8 if -- if something didn't happen for me, there's a
9 chance that anti-blackness might be the reason why
10 that happened.

11 So that's unclear to me how that might
12 have happened.

13 In terms of how has it affected me, well,
14 I've already mentioned the fact that the article
15 under question was -- they changed decisions about
16 the revision -- about the reviews from "accept with
17 revisions" to "revise and resubmit."

18 I believe that anti-blackness was, in
19 part, part of the reason that happened; right?

20 I believe that -- I had a very difficult
21 tenure battle at Hunter College from 2014 to 2016 in
22 which the chair of the music department at the time
23 tried very, very vigorously to get me fired,
24 something I just briefly mention in the introduction
25 to my -- my monograph last year. That, I believe,

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 81

1 was most certainly driven by anti-blackness.

2 So -- I even mentioned at some point in
3 that book that it -- you know, this two-year tenure
4 battle that I had to wage because this particular
5 one person was essentially claiming I was
6 incompetent at what I did, and I do believe driven
7 by anti-blackness, nobody should have to do -- go
8 through that; right. That's not something that a
9 white person should go through, that a -- or any
10 non-white person should go through.

11 But to bring it back to anti-blackness,
12 this is historically part of the fabric of the
13 United States; part that we will continue to work
14 through together, I hope, and -- and confront and
15 make things better for our children and
16 grandchildren.

17 Q So you've given two examples, this SMT --

18 A Decision on the --

19 Q -- decision on your -- not the Spectrum
20 article, but the -- the one we've been discussing in
21 Music Theory Online; right?

22 A Yes.

23 Q In which you eventually got them, in your
24 words, to follow their own rules?

25 A Correct.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 82

1 Q Did anyone ever say they wanted you to be
2 converted to a "revise and resubmit" status because
3 you were black?

4 A No.

5 Q So that was just your surmise that it had
6 to do with anti-blackness?

7 A Correct.

8 Q In the tenure dispute, which was a second
9 example you gave from your personal life, you
10 mentioned, I believe, the chair --

11 A The chair of the department.

12 Q -- campaigned to get you denied tenure?

13 A Correct.

14 Q Did he ever say that was because you were
15 black?

16 A No.

17 Q He said that was because you were
18 incompetent?

19 A Yes.

20 Q And you disagreed?

21 A Well, yeah, I disagree that I was
22 incompetent.

23 Q Correct. And it seems the school
24 eventually agreed and sided with you?

25 A Correct.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 83

1 Q And you were granted tenure?

2 A Correct.

3 Q Do you know of white professors at Hunter
4 College who have gone through similar struggles with
5 tenure.?

6 A Not similar anti-black struggles, no.

7 Q Let me rephrase that then because you
8 yourself said you never heard anyone expressly say
9 they were trying to deny you tenure because you were
10 black; correct?

11 A Yes. And it's worth pointing out that
12 that's almost always the case with anti-blackness in
13 the United States. It's a very rare person who will
14 say, I'm doing this because you are black.

15 That's just not the way anti-blackness
16 works. I'm sure you understand that.

17 Q But nevertheless, you had no evidence
18 that there was specific racist ideas leading to
19 people arguing you were incompetent when you were up
20 for tenure?

21 A You used the word "racist." I'm using the
22 word "anti-black."

23 Yes, the answer if -- if you're going --

24 Q Okay.

25 A Could you revise --

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 84

1 Q Let's use your word, "anti-black."

2 A Correct. Okay.

3 Q Is it fair to say "anti-black racism"?

4 A I prefer "anti-blackness."

5 Q Okay. Let's use your term.

6 There was no evidence that you know of
7 that anti-blackness led to individuals at Hunter
8 College to oppose your tenure?

9 A Correct.

10 Q So, again, that's your surmise?

11 A That you -- my surmise -- my -- yeah.
12 Surmise, my -- my -- my belief.

13 Q Okay.

14 A Yeah, my surmise.

15 Q And at the SMT plenary session, you were
16 received quite well?

17 A Yes.

18 Q That wasn't anti-black; right?

19 A That was not anti-black. Correct.

20 Q Incidentally, because you are a black
21 man, do you enjoy the benefits and privileges of
22 patriarchy?

23 A Yes.

24 Q But you --

25 A I'm sorry, because I'm a man, not black

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 85

1 man. You said because I'm a black man.

2 Because I'm a man, cisgender, I enjoy the
3 privileges of patriarchy.

4 Q Okay.

5 A So -- so get rid of the word "black"
6 there, please.

7 Q I believe you've argued in your article
8 in Music Theory Online that a reformed American
9 music theory should be anti-racist; right?

10 A I'm not sure that's exactly how I put it,
11 but you are not entirely incorrect.

12 Q So what would an anti-music --
13 anti-racist music theory look like?

14 A I wrote in my book, we cannot understand
15 what anti-racism will look like in music theory in
16 the future unless we understand what racist -- what
17 racism in music theory looked like in the past,
18 which is a slightly longer way of saying, I don't
19 really know what anti-racist music theory would look
20 like in the future. We are all still trying to
21 figure that out, in my opinion.

22 Q Okay. You are writing a textbook on
23 music theory now; correct?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Is that what -- something you state in

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 86

1 your textbook, that you don't know what music theory
2 will look like?

3 A No.

4 Q So you have some idea of what it should
5 look like; correct?

6 A Well, yes, of course, based on the
7 textbook that I'm co-authoring, yes.

8 Q So what would an anti-racist American
9 music theory look like now, today in 2024?

10 A Well, again, I don't know what the
11 anti-racist music theory would look like.

12 I can tell you what we are doing in our
13 book which would certainly more align with
14 anti-racism than music theory textbooks in the past.

15 Should I say what the book is about?

16 Q Tell me what your book argues is more in
17 line with anti-racist music theory in the present?

18 A Well, it's a music theory textbook, so we
19 are not putting forth arguments about anti-racism
20 and anti-blackness. That's just not something that
21 usually happens in a -- in a music theory textbook.

22 Q Okay. That's fine.

23 Now, I want to transition to talk about
24 someone I know you studied in depth, Heinrich
25 Schenker.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 87

1 You can assume that this case has
2 Heinrich Schenker in its background in many regards,
3 so I'm not going to ask you to describe who Heinrich
4 Schenker was and is.

5 But I can assume for the record that you
6 are very familiar with the work of Heinrich
7 Schenker?

8 A Uh-huh. Yes.

9 Q And he was an Austrian, Jewish music
10 theorist born in the middle of the 19th century and
11 lived into the early third of the 20th century;
12 correct?

13 A 1868 to 1935.

14 Q Okay. And he ended his life in Vienna,
15 in the center of the state of Austria?

16 A He ended his life makes it sounds like he
17 committed suicide.

18 Q I'm not -- I mean his life came to an end
19 in Austria; correct?

20 A Correct.

21 Q In Vienna?

22 A As far -- as far as I know. I -- I'm --
23 I'm not a -- really a Schenker historian like that.

24 Q Uh-huh.

25 A But I do believe he died in Vienna, yeah.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 88

1 Q Now, you argue in your article and
2 elsewhere -- article in Music Theory Online that
3 Heinrich Schenker has been very important in
4 advancing this white racial frame in music theory;
5 is that fair?

6 A The -- yeah. I'll go ahead and say yes.
7 Yes.

8 Q Okay. And how did he contribute to the
9 wait racial frame in music theory?

10 A Well, of course since he died in 1935,
11 and had virtually nothing, you know, directly to do
12 with American music theory, you have to draw a lot
13 of historical parallels, right.

14 And so you first begin with his emigre
15 students who came over here, Hans Weisse --

16 Q Uh-huh.

17 A -- would be the first name I would
18 mention. But then Felix Salzer and Oswald Jonas and
19 Ernst Oster.

20 Q Can I interrupt to ask you a question
21 about that group of scholars --

22 A Uh-huh.

23 Q -- you just mentioned?

24 A Uh-huh.

25 Q All of them were music theorists?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 89

1 A Yeah -- yes.

2 Q And were they all Jewish immigrants to
3 the United States?

4 A That I don't know.

5 Q Okay.

6 A The reason I hesitated about music
7 theorists is because the term "music theorists" was
8 not so well defined back then. They probably would
9 have said that they were a -- their specialty was
10 musikwissenschaft, which is --

11 Q And that means "the science of music,"
12 correct?

13 A Exactly. Yeah. "Musicology," was what
14 we say.

15 Q You just used a German word --

16 A For musicology --

17 Q One of these impossible German words that
18 is about longer than the alphabet?

19 A Yes. Yes.

20 Q Okay.

21 A And you can keep making them longer by
22 adding stuff at the end or the beginning. That's
23 correct.

24 Q Thank you.

25 So please continue.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 90

1 I -- I had asked you how Heinrich
2 Schenker contributed to the white racial frame and
3 you were discussing his students who came to the
4 United States?

5 A Yeah. But the question, when you say how
6 Heinrich Schenker contributed, it's a very active
7 voice you are using.

8 And in fact, you can't use that active
9 voice at all because Heinrich Schenker himself
10 didn't contribute to our white racial frame in the
11 sense that we in America created a system of music
12 theory which has, as Joe Feagin would say, a very
13 pro-White subframe of the white racial frame.

14 And -- and the ideas of tonal music were
15 very often understood through some of the musical
16 theories that Heinrich Schenker put forth.

17 But to say, How did he contribute to the
18 white racial frame, that's -- you are using the
19 active voice there that I just disagree with.
20 It's --

21 Q Okay.

22 A He didn't.

23 Q So -- and thank you.

24 You mentioned tonal music?

25 A Uh-huh.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 91

1 Q Can you please describe for the Jury and
2 for the Court here on this record what is -- in
3 terms of absolute -- you know, someone with no
4 knowledge of music theory would be able to
5 understand, such as myself, for instance.

6 What -- what does that mean? What is
7 tonal music?

8 A Well, that's a -- it's a great question
9 and it's a very -- you know, do you -- do you want
10 the short, middle, or long answer?

11 I'm going to try to go for the --

12 Q Well, please, a brief -- you know, just
13 for the record --

14 A Yeah. I'll try to go --

15 Q -- again, for the --

16 A I'll go --

17 Q -- record, but again --

18 A -- kind of middle -- middle length.

19 Q It makes it hard on him. That's why we
20 can't speak over each other.

21 A Was it --

22 Q I apologize. And it was my fault.

23 But let me rephrase my question.

24 A Uh-huh.

25 Q So briefly describe for the record what

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 92

1 "tonal music" is in -- in ways that a -- an utter
2 layperson can understand?

3 A So if you had asked me that ten, 15 years
4 ago, I would have said something like, tonal music
5 is music written in a key like C major or D minor
6 that moves -- that has what we in music theory call
7 triads and harmonies and chords that move in a
8 certain logical progression within a key of -- in
9 music; right.

10 Typical composers of such tonal music
11 would be, for example, names that the Jury probably
12 knows: Johann Sebastian Bach, Ludwig van Beethoven,
13 Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, for example.

14 And tonal music represented a roughly
15 200 -- let's call it, 250-year period from the late
16 17th century, call it, 1650, with composers like
17 with Arcangelo Corelli up through, let's say, 1900,
18 roughly.

19 Today I would give a different answer
20 because that very much is part of music theory's
21 hegemony in promoting what essentially is a white --
22 white racially framed way of conceiving of tonal
23 music or tonality; right.

24 Q And by "hegemony," you mean a system that
25 maintains its own power?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 93

1 A It's own power, yes.

2 Q Uh-huh.

3 A Yeah. Of course we haven't mentioned --
4 I haven't mentioned the term "colonial" or
5 colonialization." That's often a term used in
6 academic circles with --

7 Q Well, let's leave that aside and get back
8 to the definition of "tonal music" as you would
9 define it today?

10 A Yes, thank you.

11 So as far as I know, all peoples on our
12 planet have musics; right? And if music has
13 frequencies -- frequencies are -- are in music what
14 we call pitches; right?

15 Q You mean the actual frequency of the
16 sound?

17 A Of the sound.

18 Q Like the sound waves --

19 A Exactly.

20 Q Okay. Sorry, go ahead.

21 A Any -- any -- any sound has a frequency.
22 (Whereupon, the witness taps the
23 table.)

24 A That --

25

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 94

1 BY MR. ALLEN:

2 Q I just want --

3 A -- has a frequency.

4 Q -- to be clear that you are not talking
5 about the frequency with which music is heard or
6 something like -- you know, the -- the oftenness, if
7 that --

8 A Correct.

9 Q So let's -- now that we have cleared up
10 that, I apologize --

11 A Uh-huh.

12 Q -- and I'll stop interrupting you. Go
13 ahead.

14 A Yeah, I'm talking about acoustics and
15 physics and --

16 Q Uh-huh.

17 A -- in physics, frequency is called "Nu,"
18 you know, the Greek letter --

19 Q Uh-huh.

20 A -- that goes like that?

21 Q Yeah.

22 A That's --

23 Q Please --

24 A So if somebody says, "What's new?"

25 You say, "Frequency."

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 95

1 That's a joke.

2 Q That's a music theory joke?

3 A That's -- that's a music theory joke.

4 Q Fair.

5 A And when musics have freq- -- sounding
6 frequencies, which vib- -- any vibrating body will
7 produce, right? --

8 Q Uh-huh.

9 A -- it has potential tones and tonality;
10 right?

11 So in other parts of the world, the
12 most -- two of the most developed such systems I
13 could cite here would be ragas in the Indian
14 subcontinent or different maqam systems in Turkey
15 and the Middle East and Jordan in Arabic maqams --
16 Turkish and Arabic maqams, for example.

17 Q Uh-huh.

18 A Many, many, many centuries of tonalities
19 which are just not the same as the Bach,
20 Beethoven --

21 Q Uh-huh.

22 A -- functional tonality.

23 So in other words, rather than saying
24 that -- you'll note that I put the word "functional"
25 in front of "tonality," which is something that we

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 96

1 music theorists often talk about.

2 Functional means that the chords have
3 certain characteristics and -- and progressions that
4 they follow. So it's a word that we just use in
5 music theory.

6 Rather than thinking that functional
7 tonality is in fact the foundation for music theory
8 in the United States of America, I now say that it
9 is a foundation.

10 Q Uh-huh.

11 A And this simple grammatical shift from
12 "the foundation" to "a foundation" --

13 Q Uh-huh.

14 A -- which it is --

15 Q Uh-huh.

16 A -- actually has caused a lot of panic
17 behind the scenes because a lot of people don't want
18 to acknowledge that there are many others, that they
19 represent very interesting rich music theory
20 traditions, potentially, and that we -- a country of
21 30 -- 330 million people coming from all over the
22 planet and some of whom were here before people
23 started arriving, right, indigenous folks -- have
24 ways of thinking about music that are all valid and
25 very interesting.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 97

1 Q So everyone can have their own private
2 music theory; is that what you mean?

3 A If you got rid of the word "private," I
4 would agree with that statement.

5 Q Back to Heinrich Schenker, he is one of
6 the primary music theorists of tonal music, as you
7 described it, originally as -- let's say, this
8 period from the enlightenment to the late 19th
9 century that you described?

10 Enlightenment being the 18th century,
11 sorry?

12 A And you said, One of the most
13 important -- is that what you -- music theorists?

14 Q Yes.

15 A Yes, I think that Hugo Riemann would be
16 slightly more important.

17 Q Okay.

18 A Heinrich Schenker was very much an
19 American phenomenon. For most of the rest of the
20 world --

21 Q Uh-huh.

22 A -- dealing with the Bach through Brahms,
23 is what we sometimes call canonic composers or
24 common practice composers. There's several ways --

25 Q Uh-huh.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 98

1 A -- of talking about that -- those
2 composers. Hugo Riemann and his theories actually
3 were more important than Heinrich Schenker.

4 American music theorists might not want
5 to acknowledge that, but that's a true statement.

6 Q And you examined his -- I think it's
7 called Schenker Documents Online.

8 Can you describe briefly what that is?

9 A As far as I know -- I don't even know
10 where it's housed -- but it is -- he was a very
11 prolific writer --

12 Q Uh-huh.

13 A -- Heinrich Schenker was. And aside from
14 his main works, Harmonielehre, and Kontrapunkt, and
15 Freie Satz, Free Composition -- those are his three
16 main works; Counterpoint is in two volumes --

17 Q Uh-huh.

18 A -- there are diaries and letters and
19 correspondence and -- and essays and introductions
20 and forwards and many other things.

21 As far as I understand, Schenker
22 Documents Online is a repository -- an online
23 repository of many of those documents transcribed
24 from German and then translated by several people
25 into English.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 99

1 Q So a layperson could find this online?

2 A I think so, yeah.

3 Q And a layperson who didn't even speak
4 German, which was Schenker's language, could also
5 read these translations?

6 A Correct.

7 Q And they are in side by side, you have
8 the original text and then the translation side by
9 side?

10 A Correct.

11 Q Thank you.

12 And approximately how many pages of
13 Schenker's original writings are online in this -- I
14 think it's called the Schenker Documents Online
15 Archive?

16 A I have no idea.

17 Q If I said it was approximately 6,000
18 pages, would that -- do you think that's inaccurate?

19 A I really couldn't say.

20 Q Do you have any reason to believe it's
21 not thousands of pages?

22 A I have no reason to believe that it is
23 not thousands of pages.

24 Q And I believe in your writings you said
25 you'd identified 57 mentions in the Schenker

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 100

1 Documents Online of the word "race"?

2 A I believe so.

3 Q And is 57 mentions out of thousands of
4 pages representative of an intellectual's work over
5 their lifetime?

6 A In terms of talking about human race, I
7 think it's significant.

8 Q Okay.

9 A And it -- I would add that I don't think
10 every mention of the word "race" -- Rasse in
11 German -- was necessarily about human race, but the
12 vast majority -- you -- you could say, like, a race
13 between a turtle and a tortoise or something; right?
14 So that's -- it's not always human race, but it
15 virtually always was.

16 Q Correct.

17 And you mention a -- a -- well, what is
18 that? It's not a synonym.

19 I mean, race -- running a race and "race"
20 meaning --

21 A Human race.

22 Q -- Nineteenth century conceptions of skin
23 color in race, those are the same word in English,
24 but they're not in German, are they?

25 A Correct.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 101

1 Q Wettrennen is the word in German for
2 "race"; right?

3 A I do not know.

4 Q How well you know German?

5 A I've got a reasonable reading knowledge.

6 Q Were you reading the Schenker Documents
7 Online in the original or were you relying on the
8 translation?

9 A I was relying on the translations, but I
10 did check with the originals as I did that.

11 Q And were all the mentions of race in
12 Schenker's Schenker Documents Online negative?

13 A I can't recall.

14 Q Disparaging of black people?

15 A I can't recall.

16 Q But you still maintain that the 57
17 mentions out of something like 6,000 pages, if
18 that's accurate, is nevertheless very significant;
19 correct?

20 A I did not say "very significant." I said
21 "significant."

22 Q It's not cherry picking these 57 mentions
23 out of all those pages?

24 A I obviously was trying to find instances
25 where Heinrich Schenker had mentioned race.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 102

1 Q If you searched some word like "tone" --
2 what's the German word for "tone"?

3 A Tone -- it's "ton," t-o-n -- but --

4 Q If you searched the -- the Schenker
5 Documents Online for the word "tone," just give a
6 guesstimate of how many times that would appear in
7 Schenker's work?

8 A I really couldn't do that.

9 Q Do you think it would be more than 57?

10 A Probably.

11 Q A lot more?

12 A I couldn't say.

13 Q You do argue that Schenker's music theory
14 was anti-black; correct?

15 A I argue that there are elements of
16 anti-blackness in his music theories.

17 Q What's the connection between Schenker's
18 anti-black ideology, if we want to call it that, and
19 his ideas of music theory as it applies to tonal
20 music?

21 A I don't think he thought that much about
22 black music just for the simple reason that he
23 didn't think that it was worth attention.

24 So the --

25 Q Let me ask my question again because I

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 103

1 think that's a different -- that's an answer to a
2 different question.

3 I'm not implying that you are doing
4 anything bad here; I just want an answer to a
5 different question.

6 What's the connection between his
7 anti-blackness and his music theory?

8 Not what's the -- you know, I don't know
9 if he was hostile to black music or not, but I --
10 you have argued that he was anti-black.

11 A I --

12 Q Correct?

13 A I -- I'll just repeat what I said. I
14 believe that there are strong elements of
15 anti-blackness within his theories --

16 Q Uh-huh.

17 A -- and that he made comments as I
18 cited --

19 Q Right.

20 A -- in my work that were unequivocally
21 anti-black.

22 Q Okay. And what's the relationship
23 between his anti-blackness as it was expressed in
24 his work and his music theory of tonal music?

25 A I don't think that there's much

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 104

1 relationship at all in -- with respect to Heinrich
2 Schenker.

3 Q Okay. So you would agree with Timothy
4 Jackson in that regard?

5 A I do not know.

6 Q Have you argued that Heinrich Schenker
7 had a very hierarchal theory of tones?

8 A I've argued that he had a hierarchical
9 theory of -- of understanding tonality and --

10 Q Can you please describe that in terms
11 that a layperson could understand, for the record?

12 A Well, his entire system of music theory
13 was extremely hierarchical; right? And he found
14 levels of hierarchies in what he would consider to
15 be master works; right?

16 Q Like the great Bach, Beethoven, and so
17 forth?

18 A Exactly.

19 Q Okay.

20 A There were 12 on his list, 12 composers.

21 And he would find these -- well, he
22 called them Schichte -- these layers of -- of -- of
23 hierarchies, right, and all great music would
24 exhibit these layers and of course they were
25 fundamental structures. We all know that.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 105

1 Just for the layperson, the fundamental
2 structure is a struct- -- the tonal structure of a
3 so-called great piece of music.

4 Q Is that what some piece might refer to if
5 they say it's written in C minor or whatever it --

6 A No, that --

7 Q It's not?

8 A That's just a key; right. So C minor is
9 a key.

10 But if it's a C minor, a piece by
11 Beethoven, well, then, a priori, it's going to be a
12 great masterwork because he was one of the 12
13 composers whom Heinrich Schenker elevated above all
14 others.

15 Q Uh-huh.

16 A And it would then exhibit these
17 structural layers, it would exhibit this fundamental
18 structure that -- with a simple harmonic motion from
19 a tonic to a dominant to a tonic with a melodic
20 dissent of scale degrees above that.

21 That's inside music theory baseball, but
22 that is part of his -- well, it's some of the most
23 basic parts of his music theory.

24 And yes, hierarchy was extremely
25 important.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 106

1 Q And so is it fair, I guess, from my -- my
2 very uninformed understanding of music theory, is it
3 fair to say that in his theory, certain tones were
4 subordinate to others in the structure of an entire
5 musical piece?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And would those vary from composition to
8 composition, or was it always the case that there
9 was a superior tone?

10 A Well, it would always be the case that it
11 would come down to one of three fundamental
12 structures that he conceived.

13 Q Okay. And how is that related to
14 anti-blackness?

15 A Well, you could read my book and you'd
16 probably get some ideas of how it might be related.

17 But you are asking a very specific
18 question about Heinrich Schenker's music theories --

19 Q And its hierarchy?

20 A -- and its hierarchies.

21 And the way that I would answer that
22 question is to say, again, Heinrich Schenker died in
23 1935 and he, as far as I know, never traveled to the
24 United States of America.

25 What we have done since then in the

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 107

1 ensuing 85 -- yeah, 90 years is create a system of
2 music theory that very much has relied on Heinrich
3 Schenker's beliefs. His music theory -- music
4 theoretical beliefs.

5 And in that 90 years, there have been
6 strains of, among other things, anti-blackness,
7 anti-womanness. And it very much represents what,
8 again, I'll call it, the pro-white subframe of music
9 theory's white racial frame.

10 Q So what's the relationship between the
11 hierarchal nature of his theory of tones and this
12 anti-blackness, anti-womanness that you've just
13 sub -- described?

14 A That's something that -- that, you know,
15 one would need so long to explain that. I mean,
16 this is a deposition.

17 And I just have to fall back to the
18 history and -- and simply say that over 90 years, we
19 have created a system of tonal understanding based
20 largely on Heinrich Schenker's theories in the
21 United States of America in which the works of white
22 men -- 12 for him -- but more broadly the concepts
23 of whiteness and maleness are held in higher regard
24 than those composers who may not have identified as
25 both white and male.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 108

1 Q So is it true that you have argued -- and
2 I'm going to quote from your article in Music Theory
3 Online -- "the notion of hierarchy of a strict
4 ordering of the tones of composition is so
5 thoroughly consistent with Schenker, his deeply
6 conservative outlook on life and culture, that it is
7 difficult to uncouple his theory entirely from two
8 of his most consistently expressed ideological
9 stances: One, the centrality of the German people
10 in European culture; and two, the steady decline of
11 culture and political order in Europe since the late
12 18th century."

13 A Those are not my words. Those are the
14 words of William Drabkin, a very imminent Schenker
15 scholar, so you should check your source there.

16 I quoted --

17 Q Did you quote him?

18 A I'm quoting him but --

19 Q Did you quote him positively? You agree
20 with that?

21 A Were you suggesting that I had written
22 that?

23 Q I think it's in your article; correct?

24 A Yeah, but -- but I didn't write those
25 words.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 109

1 Q Okay.

2 A You are aware of that; right?

3 Q I -- I don't know if you did or not.

4 I'm certain that you included them in
5 your article.

6 So my question -- and this is a good
7 chance for you to clarify for the Court -- you
8 quoted another author's work; right?

9 A I did.

10 May I ask --

11 Q Approvingly?

12 A -- a question?

13 May I ask a question?

14 Q No.

15 A Oh.

16 Q I'm asking the question.

17 A Oh, okay.

18 Q I'm asking if you approve of that
19 statement?

20 A May I ask a clarification?

21 Q Sure.

22 A You just said you don't know whether I
23 wrote those words or not.

24 And I'm telling you that I did not
25 write -- write the words that you just spoke.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 110

1 Therefore, the -- the clarification is:

2 Do you actually not understand that those were not
3 my words that you just --

4 Q I think I said --

5 A -- read?

6 Q And I'm not sure if I did say this -- I
7 think I said, You argued; okay?

8 And I'm not disputing that you wrote them
9 or not.

10 A Uh-huh.

11 Q If you say you quoted another author's
12 work, that's perfectly normal in academic
13 scholarship.

14 I'm arguing -- excuse me, I'm not
15 arguing -- I'm asking if you agree with that
16 statement?

17 That's a very clear statement about the
18 relationship with the -- between the hierarchy of
19 tonal theory and ideologies of cultural supremacy of
20 the German people?

21 A Could you --

22 Q Wouldn't you agree to that?

23 A Could you reread the --

24 Q Sure.

25 A -- the quote from William Drabkin?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 111

1 Q Can you spell his name, just for the
2 record?

3 A D-r-a-b-k-i-n.

4 Q Thank you.

5 MR. PAINTER: Can I ask for a
6 clarification?

7 Which document are we referring to?
8 Is this in -- is this an article written
9 by --

10 MR. ALLEN: We are talking about
11 the --

12 MR. PAINTER: -- the school?

13 MR. ALLEN: -- Music Theory Online
14 article that the -- the deponent has
15 testified that he published 2021.

16 THE WITNESS: 2020.

17 MR. ALLEN: 2020.

18 MR. PAINTER: Can we make that an
19 exhibit to the deposition so he can have
20 it in front of him?

21 Because that will also help. I
22 assume it would have quotation marks.

23 MR. ALLEN: It's also publically
24 available online.

25 THE WITNESS: It's a block

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 112

1 quotation.

2 MR. ALLEN: Let me -- let me do that
3 after our next break.

4 MR. PAINTER: Okay.

5 MR. ALLEN: We will do that --

6 MR. PAINTER: So it's a block
7 quotation --

8 MR. ALLEN: Correct.

9 MR. PAINTER: It's very helpful if
10 it were part of it --

11 MR. ALLEN: Sure.

12 MR. PAINTER: -- then we would
13 as- -- dealt with this right away, this
14 block quotation --

15 MR. ALLEN: Sure.

16 MR. PAINTER: -- from another
17 author.

18 BY MR. ALLEN:

19 Q I think the record shows that the witness
20 remembers it accurately enough to know which author
21 he quoted and know that it was accurate quote from
22 the author; correct?

23 A Yes.

24 MR. PAINTER: Yes, we've just got to
25 reread the statement if you're going to

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 113

1 ask if he agrees with it --

2 MR. ALLEN: Absolutely. But I don't
3 want to now break and go get it.

4 MR. PAINTER: Okay.

5 MR. ALLEN: I want to ask him
6 this -- this question and then we can
7 come back to this.

8 BY MR. ALLEN:

9 Q You asked me to reread the quotation.

10 "The notion of hierarchy of a strict
11 ordering of the tones of composition is so
12 thoroughly consistent with -- Schenker -- his deeply
13 conservative outlook on life and culture that it is
14 difficult to uncouple his theory entirely from two
15 of his most consistently expressed ideological
16 stances: One, the centrality of the German people
17 in European culture; and two, the steady decline of
18 culture and political order in Europe since the late
19 18th century."

20 Now, to the best of your recollection,
21 did I read that correctly?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And -- and we'll confirm. I want to get
24 a clean copy of the article for you. I apologize
25 for not do -- not doing that in advance.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 114

1 That's a relatively clear statement of
2 the relationship between Schenker's theory of
3 hierarchy and tones and what the author, Dubkin, is
4 arguing is an ideological theory of the hierarchy of
5 the German culture or people.

6 A Uh-huh.

7 Q Correct?

8 A Uh-huh. Yes.

9 Q Do you argue that that also expresses
10 anti-blackness?

11 A I did not argue that in that article, no.

12 Q Is there no relationship between Heinrich
13 Schenker's hierarchal theory of tones and theories
14 of -- I don't know -- bogus phrenology, bogus
15 theories of the hierarchy of the races?

16 A I don't know. I couldn't answer that
17 question.

18 Q Okay. You can't answer it yes or no?

19 A Correct.

20 MR. ALLEN: Can we go off the record
21 briefly?

22 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off
23 the record. The time is 12:10.

24 (Whereupon, there was a recess taken
25 from 12:10 p.m. to 12:12 p.m.)

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 115

1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going back
2 on the record. The time is 12:12.

3 BY MR. ALLEN:

4 Q I want to make a transition,
5 Professor Ewell, and talk about the University of
6 North Texas.

7 As you know, my client, Timothy Jackson,
8 is a professor there; correct?

9 A Correct.

10 Q Are you familiar with another professor
11 there named Frank Heidlberger?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Explain for the record how you know Frank
14 Heidlberger.

15 A I cannot recall the first time I ever met
16 Frank Heidlberger. I remember meeting him in person
17 only once and I think it was in the Vancouver
18 conference of the Society for Music Theory.

19 I think I just ran into him on the
20 street, as one does at these conferences, and I saw
21 his name badge and just --

22 Q Uh-huh.

23 A -- introduced myself.

24 The Vancouver conference -- well, we'd
25 have to go to the record for that. That was

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 116

1 probably 2018ish.

2 So I think that's the only time I met
3 Frank Heidelberg -- -berg or -berger?

4 Q I believe it's Heidelberg?

5 A Heidelberg with an "e-r" at the end.
6 Okay.

7 Aside from that, at the -- at the impetus
8 of, I think it was, Ellen Bakulina, I had a piece
9 published in Theoria, the journal at the University
10 of North Texas, in a short -- in a small little
11 group of -- of three authors: Ellen Bakulina, whom
12 we've mentioned, Chris Segall, who's a professor of
13 music theory at the University of Cincinnati, and
14 me.

15 And this grew out of a -- of a session
16 that we had given, I think it was for the Russian
17 music theory interest group.

18 Q Uh-huh.

19 A And maybe it was in Vancouver. It was
20 somewhere --

21 Q This is the 2018 conference that you
22 mentioned?

23 A Don't quote me on the 2018. I'm pretty
24 sure it was Vancouver, whenever that happened.

25 Q Is it fair to say it's a -- you met at a

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 117

1 conference and it was before COVID?

2 A Yes. Oh, yes. Yes.

3 Q Before the 2020 academic year?

4 A Correct on both counts, yes.

5 Q I'm going to introduce for the record
6 Exhibit 2, which I'm handing to the court reporter
7 who will hand it to you.

8 COURT REPORTER: One moment please.

9 MR. ALLEN: Just for the record, for
10 the people -- sorry --

11 Sorry. Shall I let you mark the
12 exhibit?

13 I've got to tell them what it is.

14 COURT REPORTER: One moment please.
15 I can't take down -- once it's silent --

16 MR. ALLEN: Some day I'll invent an
17 octopus court reporter.

18 (Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 2,
19 Theoria Volume 26, 2020, was marked
20 for identification.)

21 MR. ALLEN: I'm introducing for the
22 record Exhibit 2.

23 And for those who have got the
24 exhibit pack online, this is the exhibit
25 which in my notes was 09, Theoria volume

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 118

1 26, 2020.

2 BY MR. ALLEN:

3 Q And, Professor Ewell, is that an accurate
4 description of what I've just handed you?

5 A Yes.

6 Q So I've introduced this exhibit because
7 you were just mentioning publishing in a journal.

8 Is this the journal which that discussion
9 referred to?

10 A Oh, yes, for Theoria, yes.

11 Q And describe just briefly what is the
12 journal Theoria?

13 A It's a journal that's housed at the
14 University of North Texas Press, I believe, and
15 Frank Heidelberger is the editor, the -- the -- the
16 lead. I -- you know, he's essentially -- well, does
17 it say it here?

18 Q He's listed on the --

19 A Yeah, editor.

20 Q -- first page --

21 A Yeah.

22 Q -- as the editor; correct?

23 A Frank Heidelberger, yeah. Uh-huh.

24 Q And that's the Frank Heidelberger you were
25 referring to in your testimony?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 119

1 A Correct.

2 Q And if you go the second page, there's a
3 table of contents.

4 A Uh-huh.

5 Q Correct?

6 A Yeah.

7 Q And you were talking about publishing in
8 a group of three some articles in Theoria; right?

9 A Uh-huh.

10 Q And in the title page where it says,
11 "Russian Music Theory Panel SMT 2018," is that the
12 series of articles you were referring to?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And you are listed here, I guess, the
15 fourth article down in the table of contents, Philip
16 Ewell, "Harmonic Functionalism in Russian Music
17 Theory: A Primer."

18 Did I read that correctly?

19 A Correct.

20 Q And your article started on page 61;
21 right?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Okay. I just wanted to establish we were
24 talking about the same thing and it turns out the
25 SMT conference seems to have been in 2018, just as

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 120

1 you remembered.

2 A I've got a good memory then.

3 Q So with that said, can you describe the
4 process of publishing these articles with Frank
5 Heidlberger's journal, Theoria?

6 A Yeah. I can recall -- again, I think
7 the -- the -- the key -- Ellen may have been the
8 chair of the Russian music theory interest group at
9 that time.

10 Q Uh-huh.

11 A So she was almost certainly the
12 go-between. She was of course teaching at the
13 University of North Texas at the time.

14 Q Uh-huh.

15 A I think I mentioned that she moved to
16 McGill.

17 Q Yup.

18 A Okay. So she was working with Frank,
19 like the pivot between me and Chris -- Chris
20 Segall -- and -- and -- and putting this together.

21 Q Uh-huh.

22 A And as far as I can recall, you know,
23 we -- we worked on our articles, we, you know --
24 turning a presentation into an article --

25 Q Uh-huh.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 121

1 A -- was, you know, something that we all
2 do.

3 And we submitted them together. I think
4 we each read each other's work and just commented on
5 it.

6 Q Uh-huh.

7 A And -- and then ultimately, I don't know
8 what Frank Heidelberger did with -- with them. I
9 pre- -- so yeah, I'll just stop there.

10 Q And when you say, "We read each other's
11 work," are you referring to Ellen -- please
12 pronounce her last name? Bakulina?

13 A Bakulina.

14 Q Bakulina?

15 A Yeah.

16 Q I assume Russian?

17 A That's Russian.

18 Q In origin?

19 A Yes, correct.

20 Q Thank you.

21 So Ellen Bakulina and Christopher Segall
22 and you read each other's articles?

23 A Uh-huh.

24 Q That's what you were referring to?

25 A Yes.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 122

1 Q And did Frank Heidelberger solicit these
2 articles?

3 A I'm not sure. I'm not sure how --
4 solicitation, whether Ellen approached him, he
5 approached Ellen. I can't even recall whether Frank
6 Heidelberger was at that session where we
7 delivered --

8 Q I understand. It was 2018.

9 A Yeah. Yeah.

10 Q So do you remember these articles being
11 peer reviewed in the processes we've discussed
12 earlier?

13 A If I could just go briefly back to the --
14 the plenary because we talked about the plenary and
15 the --

16 Q Correct.

17 A -- music theory Spectrum and then MTO.

18 Q Right.

19 A I didn't point out back then and I would
20 just say it now because we are talking about peer
21 review again, that as far as I can tell, as far as I
22 recall, the plenary talks for music theory are never
23 peer reviewed. So that didn't surprise me at all.

24 The -- this, eight years -- or six years
25 ago, however many years ago, I don't think that it,

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 123

1 like, was sent out for the doubly-anonymous peer
2 review.

3 Q Uh-huh.

4 A I don't think so. I don't know how Frank
5 Heidelberger dealt with the behind-the-scenes, but
6 I'm pretty certain that I didn't see any reviewer
7 one, reviewer two --

8 Q Okay.

9 A -- you know, which you normally see when
10 you are doing that.

11 So I do, of course, remember batting
12 around these articles with Ellen and Chris.

13 Q Correct. And they are close colleagues
14 of yours; is that fair to say?

15 A Yeah, yeah, yeah. They both went to the
16 CUNY Graduate Center, but I -- well, I actually
17 chaired Christopher Segall's dissertation committee.

18 Q Uh-huh.

19 A And -- and I -- I was also serving on
20 Ellen -- Ellen's dissertation committee.

21 Q Is she junior to you?

22 A Yeah, they're both junior to me. They're
23 both associate professors, both with tenure --

24 Q Uh-huh.

25 A -- and I'm a full professor, so --

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 124

1 Q Do you know if in this time period, 2018
2 to 2020 while these articles were in the works,
3 let's say --

4 A Uh-huh.

5 Q -- were they tenured then, to your
6 knowledge?

7 A I think they were both untenured.

8 Q Okay. And you had tenure at this time;
9 right?

10 A 2016 is when I got tenure, yes.

11 Q Okay. So, again, although you have a
12 very clear memory of the Music Theory Online article
13 being peer reviewed -- correct?

14 A Yes.

15 Q -- you have no memory of getting peer
16 reviews for these articles?

17 A Correct.

18 Q And do you consider the vetting of a
19 conference proposal to give a paper at the Society
20 for Music Theory in any way comparable to, I think
21 what you called, double-anonymous peer review?

22 A Yes and no. It is usually anonymous.

23 Q Uh-huh.

24 A It is reviewed and -- and a decision is
25 handed down. So yes.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 125

1 No, in the sense that you are writing
2 three- to 500 words about some ideas you want to
3 present. So it's certainly different from -- from
4 an article that appears in a -- in a journal.

5 Q And just for the -- the sake of the
6 record of a lay Jury that may not be involved in
7 publication, three- to 400 words is basically a
8 paragraph; right?

9 A I would call it two paragraphs.

10 Q Okay. And it's certainly not a article
11 that spans 24 pages such as you published in --

12 A Correct.

13 Q -- Theoria?

14 A Correct.

15 Q So in that sense, the 24-page paper that
16 was published in Theoria was not peer reviewed,
17 correct, to the best of your recollection?

18 A Yes, that's correct.

19 Q So if -- well, I'll strike that.

20 And do you have any reason to believe
21 that the process for publishing the other two
22 papers, the paper by Ellen Bakulina or Christopher
23 Segall, which are also listed here, were subjected
24 to any other process than -- or was it the same as
25 yours?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 126

1 A I -- I don't know.

2 Q Okay. Was there any controversy that you
3 recall over the review process at UNT for the
4 publication of these articles?

5 A Any controversy, you --

6 Q Yes?

7 A -- said?

8 No, not that I can recall.

9 Q Was there any criticism, to the best of
10 your knowledge, that these articles were not
11 subjected to double-anonymous peer review?

12 A Not that I recall, no.

13 Q While we are at it -- and this will be
14 the last few questions before we break for lunch --
15 have you ever published -- besides this article,
16 which we just talked about, and also the Spectrum
17 article, which we talked about earlier, have you
18 ever published articles that weren't subjected to
19 peer review in any academic journal?

20 A I think the short answer would be no.

21 I could just elaborate a little bit and
22 say that I have -- well, certainly over 30
23 publications, somewhere between 30 and 40, let's
24 say. The article is one genere, let's call it;
25 right.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 127

1 Q Of course.

2 A So a review essay, book chapters,
3 review -- conference review, the introduction I
4 mentioned earlier. So obviously they all come with
5 different sets of guidelines --

6 Q Uh-huh.

7 A -- and expectations.

8 The academic articles that I have
9 published have all been peer reviewed with, I
10 suppose, this exception.

11 And in my own mind, if I could just
12 elaborate a little bit, because I do recall that
13 this was not peer reviewed. This almost in my --
14 it's almost as if it wasn't an article in the same
15 way that "Music Theory and the White Racial Frame"
16 was, if that makes sense.

17 Q The -- the one that was published in
18 Music Theory Online?

19 A Correct. Yeah.

20 Q Okay. And -- well, we've already
21 discussed the -- the difference between that and
22 Spectrum.

23 Okay. Just -- just one more question.

24 So have you ever known academic articles
25 to cite Wikipedia in any way?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 128

1 A No.

2 Q Do you know if Theoria has ever had
3 articles that cite Wikipedia?

4 A I do not know.

5 Q Is that a sign that a journal is of
6 inferior quality, in your mind as an academic
7 scholar?

8 A Well, it's highly unusual because of the
9 open access, open nature of Wikipedia.

10 Q Is it appropriate to -- to cite anything
11 like social media in the same way?

12 A It depends on the article, it depends on
13 the journal, it depends on the editor, it depends on
14 the topic --

15 Q Uh-huh.

16 A -- of -- of what's being written in what
17 venue.

18 So you'd -- you'd have to be more
19 specific.

20 Q Is it appropriate to cite, I don't know,
21 content on YouTube in an academic article?

22 A If in fact the author -- of course, all
23 of these decisions would ultimately fall with the
24 editor and the editorial team; right?

25 And if in fact something is put up on

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 129

1 YouTube with some type of, I don't know, gravitas
2 behind it, and I don't even know what that would
3 look like frankly, I imagine that there -- I don't
4 know, a Ted talk or something, that there's
5 something that's out there, that that would
6 potentially be more acceptable to the editor of an
7 academic journal than Wikipedia would be because of
8 the open nature of Wikipedia.

9 Q Would it be acceptable in an academic
10 field to quote Wikipedia, for instance, as an
11 example of what the state of common knowledge out
12 there in the world may be?

13 A Sure. That would be acceptable, yeah.

14 Q Okay.

15 A I mean, that's -- that's my opinion,
16 obviously.

17 Q Your opinion as an informed academic
18 scholar?

19 A Absolutely yeah. But I'm sure there
20 would be people who would disagree with me.

21 Q And, as you said, an author -- an author
22 of at least 30 academic publications?

23 A Thank you for the compliment.

24 Q And how many books to date?

25 A Oh, just one.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 130

1 Q Just one?

2 A Yeah.

3 MR. ALLEN: We'll go off the record.

4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off
5 the record. The time is 12:27.

6 (Whereupon, there was a recess taken
7 from 12:27 p.m. to 1:28 p.m.)

8 (Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 3,
9 Article Entitled "Music Theory and
10 the White Racial Frame" Written by
11 Philip Ewell, Published in Music
12 Theory Online, was marked for
13 identification.)

14 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going back
15 on the record. The time is 1:28.

16 BY MR. ALLEN:

17 Q Professor Ewell, I have taken the liberty
18 of marking as Exhibit Number 3 for the record. This
19 will be -- for the people who are remote, this will
20 be sent to you as marked 023.

21 It's an article in Music Theory Online,
22 which we've discussed earlier. And I'm going to ask
23 you to confirm for the record that this is the
24 article that we discussed earlier?

25 A Correct.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 131

1 Q And it's titled, "Music Theory and the
2 White Racial Frame"?

3 A Correct.

4 Q And if I could ask you to turn to
5 section 4.4 in the article, I believe you'll find
6 that on page 11?

7 A Uh-huh.

8 Q Right above that is a subsection where
9 there's the quote that I had read aloud into the
10 record earlier; correct?

11 A Correct.

12 Q And just as you said, it's a block quote
13 from William Drabkin?

14 A Uh-huh.

15 Q And prior to introducing that quote, you
16 said, "In numerous writings, he" -- meaning
17 Schenker; correct? -- "insisted that his views" --
18 meaning Schenker's views -- "on racial and national
19 hierarchies were key to his beliefs on life and on
20 music."

21 Right?

22 A Right above the block quotation?

23 Q Yeah.

24 A Oh, yeah.

25 Okay. Can you -- can you say that again,

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 132

1 please?

2 Q Yeah, the -- the second to last
3 sentence --

4 A Uh-huh.

5 Q -- before that quote is introduced is
6 your writing; correct?

7 A Correct.

8 Q And it says, "In numerous writings,
9 he" -- meaning Schenker -- "insisted that his
10 views" -- meaning Schenker's view -- "on racial and
11 national hierarchies were key to his beliefs on life
12 and music."

13 Correct?

14 A Correct.

15 Q And in fact, you introduced that
16 paragraph with the topic sentence, "I wish to
17 recouple this severed link between Schenker's
18 hierarchal beliefs about music and his hierarchal --
19 hierarchical beliefs about people."

20 Did I read that correctly?

21 A Yes.

22 Q So -- and this is the last question, just
23 a yes or no question.

24 So it's fair to say, as we discussed
25 earlier, that you were quoting William Drabkin,

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 133

1 which we read earlier into the record, with
2 approval?

3 A It's not just yes or no.

4 It's -- it is his agreement with some of
5 the -- the basic elements of recoupling this -- this
6 severed link.

7 With approval? Ye- -- yeah, I think it's
8 fair to just say with approval. Yeah, that's fair.

9 Q And you believe there's a link between
10 this view of racial hierarchy, national hierarchies,
11 and Schenker's belief about the hierarchy of tones?

12 A Yes. I believe so because Heinrich
13 Schenker was very explicit himself in --

14 Q Okay.

15 A -- in making those connections.

16 Q And I have no further questions about
17 that article, which we've already discussed.

18 I -- I would like to turn to discussing
19 another journal called the Journal for [sic]
20 Schenkerian Studies.

21 Are you familiar with that journal?

22 A Yes. Is it "Journal of" or "Journal
23 for"?

24 Q I believe you are right it's "for
25 Schenkerian Studies"?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 134

1 A Oh, no, no.

2 You said "for" and I thought it was "of,"

3 but --

4 Q You know what, I don't want to make a
5 mistake for the record here, so I --

6 So you were correct to point that out.

7 It is the Journal of Schenkerian Studies.

8 A Good.

9 Q Thank you.

10 And so I -- I take from your answer that
11 you are familiar with it?

12 A Of course.

13 Q Have you published in it?

14 A Yes.

15 Q When did you publish an article in the
16 Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

17 A Oh, when? 2004 or '05. It was one of my
18 very first published articles.

19 Q Was that journal article handled by
20 Timothy Jackson?

21 A I have no idea.

22 Q Was there any suggestion at that time
23 that the Journal of Schenkerian Studies was
24 publishing racist articles?

25 A What do you mean by "racist articles"?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 135

1 Q Well, I don't -- I don't mean anything by
2 it, but what I'm asking: Was anyone accusing the
3 journal of being racist at that time, whatever they
4 meant by it?

5 A I don't understand the question when you
6 used -- if -- you'd have to define what "racist"
7 means.

8 Q Do you recall anyone ever accusing the
9 Journal of Schenkerian Studies at the time you
10 published it -- in it of being racist?

11 A Again, race -- "racism" and "racist" are
12 in -- as I state, very clearly in my monograph. I
13 consider those words trip wires, which is why I
14 don't often use them in my own work. They've become
15 everything and nothing, specifically "racist."

16 So if you are asking me -- the question
17 is if a journal is racist --

18 Q I'm not asking you if the Journal of
19 Schenkerian Studies is racist, so please don't
20 misunderstand my question. Let me rephrase it.

21 Did you hear of anyone else accusing the
22 journal at the time you published in it of being
23 racist, whatever they may have meant by that?

24 A It's hard to answer that question yes or
25 no if you can't clarify what "racist" means in this

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 136

1 context.

2 Q Did you ever hear anyone say the journal
3 was racist?

4 A No.

5 Q Thank you.

6 What was your understanding of Timothy
7 Jackson's relationship to the Journal of Schenkerian
8 Studies from the time you published in it back in --
9 in the -- you know, sounds like the 2000s, to 2020?

10 A Well, in that time, I have to be honest,
11 I basically never thought of that journal.

12 Q Uh-huh.

13 A I published in it and then I -- then
14 20 years -- well, I don't know how many years, but
15 almost 20 years passed.

16 Q Uh-huh.

17 A And if you were to say that Timothy
18 Jackson was part of the original -- my original
19 thing, I would -- I wouldn't be surprised.

20 But I just don't recall 20 years ago what
21 his relationship was, if there was a relationship,
22 to the journal at that point.

23 Q By "your thing," you mean your article?

24 A My article and it was in Volume 1, the
25 very first issue of the journal.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 137

1 And then up until Volume 12, which had
2 the symposium of responses to my plenary talk --

3 Q Uh-huh.

4 A -- that -- it was at that time that it
5 was kind of -- my memory was jogged that, Oh yes,
6 Timothy Jackson has something to do with this
7 journal, in fact.

8 Q Okay. So you anticipated my next
9 question is that you were aware of a special
10 symposium meant to be published in Volume 12 of the
11 Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

12 A I was -- the clarification. I was aware
13 when exactly?

14 Q Well, why don't you answer your own
15 question.

16 When were you aware that there was a
17 symposium to be published in Volume 12?

18 A Good. Okay. That's a question I can
19 answer.

20 I think -- and I wrote about this in my
21 book -- I think somewhere or somehow I heard that
22 there might be a symposium in the fall of -- oh,
23 God, this would have been the -- right -- some time
24 the fall, winter of 2019 --

25 Q Uh-huh.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 138

1 A I'm sorry, 2019 -- yes, 2019.

2 But then I for sure became aware of it
3 when there was a call for papers announced. And I
4 think, if I'm not mistaken, that was on
5 December 31st, 2019.

6 And it had a very quick turnaround, which
7 everybody was like, Wait, what's going on with this?

8 So it was a strange three-week
9 turnaround, like, sub- -- submit this by then.

10 Q Uh-huh.

11 A So when that call for papers was
12 announced, whatever date it was, but late -- call it
13 late December 2019, I was of course aware --

14 Q Uh-huh.

15 A -- that this was happening.

16 Q Do you remember who you heard that from?

17 A I think it was the SMT Listserv where
18 call- -- where such calls are usually put out.

19 Q Okay. And so you were a subscriber to
20 the SMT list -- Listserv?

21 A Correct.

22 Q And you had already testified today, I
23 believe, you were -- you were at that time a member
24 of the Society for Music Theory, SMT?

25 A Yes.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 139

1 Q Did you ever read any of the articles in
2 the symposium which appeared in Volume 12, published
3 in 2020?

4 A Not when it came out.

5 Q Have you since read them?

6 A Yes.

7 Q When did you read them?

8 A As I was writing my book, because that's
9 when I actually did respond to ten of the authors
10 of -- of that symposium.

11 And -- well, the book came out in
12 2023 April, so I would guess if I would say when I
13 actually read the 15 responses -- and I have to put
14 the "responses" in scare quotes because it didn't
15 seem to me that they were really responses to what I
16 had said in the plenary -- I would guess -- let me
17 think here -- fall -- fall of '21, early 2022.

18 Q Okay.

19 A Some time in 2022 probably.

20 Q Okay. And this was the time leading up
21 to the publication of your monograph; is that fair?

22 A Correct, yeah.

23 Q Okay.

24 A During the process. Because chapter
25 three or four is in fact --

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 140

1 Q Okay.

2 A -- on the Journal -- Volume 12 of the
3 Journal of Schenkerian Studies.

4 Q And just to be clear, by "monograph," we
5 understand I mean an ac- -- an academic book?

6 A Correct.

7 Q All right. So I want to take you back to
8 the time before you had read the responses published
9 in the symposium and when you heard about it.

10 And what was your criticism of the
11 symposium in that time window before you had
12 actually read the symposium papers?

13 A I had seen on Twitter and probably
14 Facebook -- I've -- I left Twitter between one and
15 two years ago; I deleted my account.

16 But I was on Twitter and Facebook and I
17 saw some of the quotations, and they were very
18 strange, I thought to myself.

19 Q Uh-huh.

20 A And of course, I knew that I had not been
21 contacted to be part of this symposium, which struck
22 me as strange. So I knew about some of those
23 things.

24 Most of what I was -- any -- if you are
25 asking me what my opinion was of what was going on

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 141

1 not having read the actual responses, it was
2 probably based on what I was seeing on social media.

3 Q What was based on what you were seeing on
4 social media? What do you mean by that?

5 A My opinions about what the --

6 Q Okay.

7 A -- symposium was about.

8 Q And your opinions were that this seemed
9 strange?

10 A Yes.

11 Q And stuff.

12 Do you think it was improper for the
13 Journal of Schenkerian Studies to publish the
14 symposium before you read it?

15 A I believe it was improper to do so
16 without any participation by me.

17 Q Any other reason you thought it was
18 improper for the Journal of Schenkerian Studies to
19 publish the symposium besides not contacting you?

20 A The anonymous submission. One of the
21 submissions was written anonymously, and that struck
22 me as very strange also.

23 Q So we have -- there was -- you allege
24 there was no contact to you. There's also an
25 anonymous publication in the symposium.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 142

1 Was there anything else that you
2 criticized about the Journal of Schenkerian Studies
3 publishing the symposium?

4 A I wouldn't say there was no contact. I
5 mentioned in my book that two professors at the
6 University of North contact -- North Texas contacted
7 me as it was being put together.

8 One was Ellen Bakulina. The other was
9 Stephen Slottow --

10 Q Okay.

11 A -- who I think is an associate professor
12 of music theory --

13 Q Uh-huh.

14 A -- at the University of North Texas, also
15 one of the managing editors, along with Timothy
16 Jackson, of that -- of that volume.

17 Separately, they contacted me. Stephen
18 Slottow wanted to know where he could find the
19 slides to the presentation I had given.

20 Q The -- the plenary talk at the SMT --

21 A Correct.

22 Q -- in 2019?

23 A Correct. Yeah.

24 And at that point the slides were on my
25 website --

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 143

1 Q Uh-huh.

2 A -- so I told him where to get them.

3 Q Uh-huh.

4 A And then Ellen Bakulina wrote an e-mail
5 simply asking me if I had any questions about these
6 responses that were being put together, to which I
7 responded, No, I don't have any questions.

8 Q Did anything prevent Ellen Bakulina from
9 inviting you to participate in the Journal of
10 Schenkerian Studies symposium?

11 A I have no idea.

12 Q But she didn't invite you?

13 A No.

14 Q You don't know of anything that prevented
15 her from inviting you to participate?

16 A No.

17 Q So let me again summarize: You -- you've
18 identified the, I guess, failure of the journal to
19 contact you in the way you wanted to be contacted;
20 is that fair?

21 A No. It -- the way I want to be contacted
22 is -- well, it's not really up to me.

23 I'm -- I am taking issue with the notion
24 that somebody would respond to what effectually was
25 nine minutes of a discussion of Heinrich Schenker --

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 144

1 there were another 13 minutes that had nothing to do
2 with Heinrich Schenker that I spoke about at that
3 plenary session, so Heinrich Schenker was roughly
4 nine minutes -- that responses would be put together
5 without having the person to whom they were
6 responding have a chance to address the issues
7 brought up in the responses, which is industry
8 standard for such colloquies or symposiums in
9 academia.

10 Q What made you think you were being
11 excluded from commenting on the symposium responses
12 to your plenary address?

13 A I have no idea.

14 Q Did anyone tell you you would not be
15 allowed to respond to them?

16 A No.

17 Q And you now said that you actually were
18 contacted both by Professor Slottow and Ellen
19 Bakulina; correct?

20 A Yeah, but that was not to ask me to be
21 part of this --

22 Q And you were --

23 A -- symposium.

24 Q -- you received the SMT call for papers;
25 correct?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 145

1 A I did.

2 Q But it's your testimony today that that
3 also wasn't an appropriate way to contact you?

4 A Yes, it was not appropriate.

5 Q And can you just explain for the record
6 what would have been the most appropriate way to
7 contact you in your experience as an academic?

8 A Well, I've never been a respondent like
9 that so I would only be speculating.

10 But it would -- I -- I presume that it
11 would be one of the lead editors who would reach out
12 to the person who was -- who -- who originally gave
13 the talk to which people were responding to invite
14 them to be part of a colloquy or symposium.

15 Q Did you reach out to anyone on the
16 editorial board to ask them about that?

17 A No.

18 Q Why not?

19 A It's not my place to invite myself to a
20 party thrown in my honor.

21 Q Was there any criticism of your paper
22 aired at the plenary talk you gave in 2019?

23 A Not to my knowledge.

24 Q Was that proper?

25 A A lack of criticism?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 146

1 Q That there wouldn't be any invitation to
2 criticism of your paper at the symposium that you
3 gave -- not symposium, the plenary talk you gave in
4 2019?

5 A The question is: Would that have been
6 proper, you said?

7 Q Was it proper that there was no form for
8 criticism of your plenary address?

9 A Yeah, plenary addresses never really --

10 Q Okay.

11 A -- have Q&As afterward. In music theory,
12 I should say.

13 Q So, again, I'm trying to get a -- the
14 universe of things that you thought was improper
15 about the publication of the symposium in 2020 by
16 the Journal of Schenkerian Studies.

17 It's not improper that it addressed your
18 plenary talk; right?

19 A No.

20 Q But you've said that they didn't contact
21 you in the way that you have argued is industry
22 standard?

23 A Correct.

24 Q You've also identified the publication of
25 an anonymous author?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 147

1 A Correct.

2 Q Are there any other things you found to
3 be improper about the Journal for -- of Schenkerian
4 Studies publication of the symposium?

5 A Only -- I -- I would say only what I've
6 read in what was ultimately called, I think, an ad
7 hoc panel that some UNT professors had convened to
8 look into how this journal issue was put together.

9 That is something I did read --

10 Q Uh-huh.

11 A -- and I think I've hit on the points
12 that they made. And that's what I'm basing this on
13 because I hadn't read --

14 Q Okay.

15 A -- the contents.

16 Q When did you read the ad hoc panel
17 report?

18 A Probably shortly after it came out and I
19 can't remember when that was.

20 Q And just for the record, is this the ad
21 hoc panel that was published by the University of
22 North Texas on its website on November 25th, 2020?

23 A You -- probably but, you know, I would
24 need to see that document.

25 Q Do you remember it being around the end

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 148

1 of 2020 when that appeared?

2 A I can't recall.

3 Q Okay. You don't know of any other ad hoc
4 panel that addressed the Journal for Schenkerian
5 Studies, though; correct?

6 A Correct.

7 Q Okay. What were the things that you read
8 in the ad hoc panel's report that stand out to you
9 as improper?

10 A I think the two that I've mentioned:
11 The -- the inclusion of an anonymous --

12 Q Uh-huh.

13 A -- author, and the lack -- oh, the lack
14 of peer review that's -- that we hadn't talked about
15 that. So three things.

16 The lack of peer review, the anonymous
17 author, and the one that we just said, the fact that
18 I was not part of the colloquy.

19 Q Okay. Any other things that you
20 remember?

21 A No.

22 Q Okay. So as you sit here today, you only
23 have identified the lack of peer review, the
24 anonymous author's publication, and that you weren't
25 contacted in the way that you feel was an industry

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 149

1 **standard?**

2 A Yes.

3 Q **Okay. Did you ever argue that the**
4 **Journal for Schenkerian Studies should be censored?**

5 A I think I used in my book kind of as a
6 question, Is there no reason for condemnation, or
7 possibly I used the word "censure."

8 In other words, it seems so out of the
9 ordinary, that anonymous authorship and just to not
10 invite the person, that it -- that, you know, I
11 prob- -- think in my book I used, Is there -- is
12 there no situation in which condemnation is -- is --
13 is appropriate for out of the ordinary or as I just
14 said, not industry standard aspects of the
15 publication of this issue.

16 Q **Do you approve of the censorship of the**
17 **Journal of Schenkerian Studies?**

18 A I don't know enough about it, frankly,
19 to -- to say that I approve of it.

20 Q **Are you aware that the Journal of**
21 **Schenkerian Studies is no longer published by the**
22 **University of North Texas Press?**

23 A I was unaware of that.

24 Q **Now that you do know of that, assuming**
25 **that it's true, do you approve of that?**

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 150

1 A I don't know enough about it to make a
2 judgment on that.

3 Q Do you think a journal should be ordered
4 to cease publication for pub- -- for publishing the
5 symposium that was published in the Journal of
6 Schenkerian Studies that was published in 2020?

7 A I would need to know more information. I
8 really couldn't say.

9 Q What more information do you need to
10 know? It stopped publication; right?

11 A You just said, "allegedly stopped
12 publication," so --

13 Q No, I said it did stop publication.

14 A Well, you added -- you added the word
15 "allegedly."

16 Q Let me do this.

17 A But that's okay. That's okay.

18 Q Assume that that's true.

19 A Okay.

20 Q Is that appropriate?

21 A I don't know enough about it to make a
22 comment on it.

23 Q You commented earlier that you thought
24 the First Amendment was a benefit to the United
25 States; correct?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 151

1 A Yes.

2 Q And you do though -- know that the
3 University of North Texas is a public institution --

4 A I do, yes.

5 Q -- of the State of Texas?

6 Let me finish.

7 So is it appropriate in your view as an
8 academic professional for a state institution to
9 order the publication of a journal to cease over the
10 publication of the symposium of a --

11 MR. PAINTER: Objection.

12 Are with you asking for a legal
13 opinion interpreting the First Amendment
14 or are you simply asking for an opinion
15 generally as an academic --

16 MR. ALLEN: I believe I prefaced the
17 question: In his experience as an
18 academic professional.

19 MR. PAINTER: So you are not asking
20 for First Amendment interpretation and
21 the fact that it's a state institution
22 and the legal questions are not a factor
23 in your --

24 MR. ALLEN: Well, the state
25 institution is a simple fact.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 152

1 MR. PAINTER: Yes.

2 MR. ALLEN: That's not a legal issue
3 in this case.

4 The First Amendment is something
5 he's already testified to.

6 MR. PAINTER: Yes, but he's not
7 provided legal opinion on that and you
8 are not asking him --

9 MR. ALLEN: I'm not asking for a
10 legal opinion.

11 BY MR. ALLEN:

12 Q So, Professor Ewell, I'm just asking in
13 your experience as an academic professional and
14 assuming it's true that the University of North
15 Texas has instructed the University of North Texas
16 Press to stop publishing the Journal of Schenkerian
17 Studies, is that appropriate in your view?

18 A I don't have enough information to make
19 that judgment.

20 Q And what more information would you need?

21 A Well, I could imagine I would need to
22 know some more of the particulars about what
23 actually happened behind the scenes and I'm just not
24 privy to that information.

25 Q You've read the University of North

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 153

1 Texas, quote, ad hoc panel report; correct?

2 A Yes.

3 Q That wasn't enough information for you?

4 A Correct. It was not enough information.

5 Q Were you ever aware that Timothy Jackson
6 also replied -- wrote a reply to that so-called ad
7 hoc panel report?

8 A I was not.

9 Q Do you know of anywhere his response to
10 the ad hoc panel report has been published?

11 A No.

12 Q To your knowledge, is that available on
13 the University of North Texas' website?

14 A I have no idea.

15 Q Is that industry standard to issue a
16 report condemning an academic and not allowing his
17 response to be published on the website?

18 A I have no idea.

19 Q How long have you been a professor?

20 A Twenty-two years.

21 Q But you have no idea?

22 A I have no idea about the question you
23 just asked me, yeah.

24 Q Did you feel personally demeaned by the
25 symposium published in the University of North Texas

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 154

1 Press' Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

2 A Only in the sense that I was not invited
3 to this process.

4 Q If you were invited, would you have
5 responded?

6 A I would have needed to see the outlines
7 of the symposium, who was saying what.

8 I wouldn't have agreed immediately, but I
9 would have been interested in being part of it.

10 Q Did you ever speak with Ellen Bakulina
11 about her failure to invite you to respond to
12 symposium?

13 A No.

14 Q Why didn't you raise this issue with her?

15 A It wasn't my place, I felt.

16 Q Did you talk to any of the editors of the
17 Journal of Schenkerian Studies about the failure to
18 invite you?

19 A No.

20 Q Did you ever feel dehumanized by the
21 Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

22 A Well, you used the word "demeaned" and
23 now you are saying "dehumanized." So I guess I
24 would ask for a little clarification.

25 What's the difference between those two

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 155

1 things to you?

2 Q Well, I'm not testifying today,
3 Professor Ewell. So why don't we start with what
4 you understand by "dehumanized"? You can put that
5 in the record.

6 A May I ask for points of clarification of
7 you?

8 Q No. I'm asking you what you understand
9 by "dehumanized"?

10 A I'd like a -- a minute just to consult
11 with my counsel.

12 MR. ALLEN: He has to answer the
13 question that's on the record.

14 MR. PAINTER: Okay. Are you saying,
15 did he use the word "dehumanize"?

16 MR. ALLEN: I want him to explain
17 what he understands by "dehumanize."
18 That's a perfectly normal question in a
19 deposition.

20 MR. PAINTER: Yeah. When he used
21 it? Are you referring --

22 MR. ALLEN: He's an academic with
23 20 years-plus experience. If he's --

24 MR. PAINTER: But if you're
25 referring --

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 156

1 MR. ALLEN: If he's going to testify
2 that he has no idea --

3 MR. PAINTER: Yeah.

4 MR. ALLEN: -- what "dehumanize"
5 means, he can put that on the record.

6 MR. PAINTER: Okay. But you are not
7 asking about a specific time which he
8 said "dehumanized" in the past? You are
9 not asking him that, are you?

10 MR. ALLEN: Richard, I'm conducting
11 my deposition and there's a question
12 before him and I want him to answer it.

13 BY MR. ALLEN:

14 Q If you don't know the definition of
15 "dehumanize" or if you don't understand that word,
16 you can just say so.

17 But I want to know what you understand by
18 "dehumanize"?

19 A And I just am pointing out that you used
20 whether I felt demeaned and then you asked whether I
21 felt dehumanized.

22 And I think it's perfectly reasonable for
23 me to say -- to ask you for -- as a point of
24 clarification, and that's all it is really, what the
25 difference is between demeaning and dehumanizing.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 157

1 If you are asking me -- so I'll go ahead.

2 We don't need to --

3 Q Yes.

4 A -- to go further down that rabbit hole --
5 whether I know what the word "dehumanizing" means, I
6 have some ideas, yeah.

7 Q Well, please explain for the Court what
8 you understand by the word "dehumanized"?

9 A To be treated less than human.

10 Q And did you feel that the Journal treated
11 you less than human in this time period before you
12 read the actual article?

13 A Only in the sense that they didn't reach
14 out to me to simply make me part of the process.

15 Q So that, to you, is dehumanizing?

16 A I think I would prefer to say it's
17 demeaning, the way that you said earlier, and not
18 dehumanizing.

19 Q Okay. Incidentally, are you aware of an
20 open letter -- or let me put it this way -- an open
21 letter by the Society for Music Theory condemning
22 the symposium published in the Journal of
23 Schenkerian Studies in 2020?

24 A I was aware of that, yeah.

25 Q Do you believe that open letter was

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 158

1 consistent -- well, let me back up and strike that
2 question.

3 What did the open letter say, to your
4 knowledge?

5 A Oh, to my recollection, yeah, it was
6 condemning -- it was an open letter on anti-racism
7 in the Society for Music Theory.

8 It was drafted by eight music theorists.
9 It had over 900 signatories because it was an open
10 letter. I was one of the signatories.

11 Q Uh-huh.

12 A It -- it mentioned the Journal of
13 Schenkerian Studies, Volume 12, although I don't
14 think it mentioned Timothy Jackson's name.

15 And it essentially raised some points
16 about how we can think about anti-racism in the
17 field in the Society for Music Theory moving
18 forward.

19 Q Do you think that was consistent with the
20 SMT statement of -- on ethics?

21 A I don't know what you are talking about,
22 the statement on ethics.

23 Q Sure.

24 (Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 4,
25 Printout from Society of Music Theory

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 159

1 Website, was marked for
2 identification.)

3 MR. ALLEN: I want to introduce in
4 the record as Exhibit 4 a printout from
5 the website of the Society for Music
6 Theory.

7 For the people online, this was
8 marked in the exhibit pack as "07 SMT
9 statement."

10 And I'm handing a copy to
11 Professor Ewell's counsel.

12 MR. PAINTER: Do we have the letter
13 too as an exhibit so he can look at that
14 letter?

15 MR. ALLEN: I don't. Not right now.

16 MR. PAINTER: So his recoll- --
17 he'll just have to try to remember what
18 was in that letter.

19 MR. ALLEN: Uh-huh. That's fine at
20 this time.

21 MR. PAINTER: Okay.

22 BY MR. ALLEN:

23 Q Have you had a chance to review this,
24 Professor Ewell?

25 A One second.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 160

1 Q Sure.

2 A Okay.

3 Q So you testified earlier that you believe
4 strongly in academic societies like the Society for
5 Music Theory honoring its own policies; right?

6 A Yes.

7 Q They should follow their own rules;
8 right?

9 A Correct.

10 Q This SMT policy on ethics should be
11 followed by the Society for Music Theory; correct?

12 A Correct.

13 Q It "upholds and promotes the following
14 basic principles of ethical conduct in our
15 profession," in the first line; correct?

16 A Correct.

17 Q And they are numbered one through seven?

18 A Correct.

19 Q The first is, "Freedom of inquiry and the
20 widest possible access to information of use to
21 scholars."

22 Right?

23 A Correct.

24 Q Can we both agree that the censorship of
25 an academic journal is not consistent with that

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 161

1 policy number one?

2 A Can I ask what you mean by "censor- --
3 censorship"?

4 Q Sure. Ordering an academic publication
5 to cease and suppressing its publication?

6 A And now the original question, please?

7 Q Is suppressing the publication of an
8 academic journal consistent with the principle
9 number one in the SMT policy on ethics?

10 A I -- I would say no.

11 Q I want to skip down to number three.

12 "Respect for diverse points of view and
13 the potential worth of scholarship on any aspect of
14 music theory or any related subject."

15 Did I read that correctly?

16 A Uh-huh. Yes.

17 Q Is the -- I'm sorry.

18 Is the suppression of a journal, an
19 academic journal, by a state institution such as the
20 University of North Texas consistent -- consistent
21 with principle number three?

22 A One second. I'm going to read it again,
23 please.

24 Q Uh-huh.

25 A It's not consistent only in the sense

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 162

1 that the diverse points of view to which they claim
2 they -- they followed should have included a
3 response the person to whom they were responding.

4 So they did not respect the diverse
5 points of view because that --

6 Q "They" being?

7 A "They," the -- the Journal of Schenkerian
8 Studies, Volume 12, did not respect the diverse
9 points of view.

10 If they had, I would have been invited --
11 and I shouldn't have to respond to a call for
12 papers -- invited to be part of a colloquy because
13 this is academic freedom and inquiry.

14 Q So that really wasn't my question.

15 Was suppressing the publication of the
16 Journal of Schenkerian Studies consistent with
17 principle number three?

18 A I don't know in the sense that -- in the
19 sense that I don't believe that they completely
20 followed point number three, whether --

21 Q "They" being the SMT?

22 A No, "they" being Volume 12 of the Journal
23 of Schenkerian Studies.

24 And how exactly authorities at the
25 University of North Texas deal with that, well, I

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 163

1 don't know. I can't comment on that. I just don't
2 know enough.

3 Q Do you believe the SMT open letter
4 condemning the Journal of Schenkerian Studies as you
5 remember it was consistent with these policies on
6 ethics that they have promulgated here?

7 A That's a tough one because I don't
8 rec- -- remember it, obviously, verbatim. I -- I
9 just -- I -- I -- that's too hard for me to answer
10 because I just don't recall what -- what's written
11 there.

12 Q If you believed the SMT had violated this
13 policy on ethics at the time, would you have spoken
14 up about it?

15 A If I believed that they had violated it?
16 I believe that it would have been
17 virtually impossible for me to know that at the
18 time. So that's a very hypothetical question that I
19 would rather not answer yes to because of its
20 hypothetical nature.

21 Q That's fair enough.

22 Do you remember anyone in the SMT raising
23 the policy on ethics at that time in reference to
24 the Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

25 A Well, there were the eight authors of the

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 164

1 open letter. They certainly raised it.

2 Q No. No. I mean, did they raise this
3 policy on ethics?

4 A Oh. Raise -- I don't recall anyone, no.

5 Q Okay. Were you aware of this policy on
6 ethics in 2020?

7 A I don't think I was, no.

8 MR. ALLEN: I'm going to introduce
9 in the record a document I've marked as
10 Exhibit Number 5.

11 And for people who are viewing the
12 deposition virtually, this was originally
13 in your packet, 012, the Denton Record
14 Chronicle article.

15 And I'm handing a copy to
16 Professor Ewell's counsel.

17 (Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 5,
18 Article Titled "A UNT Professor
19 Challenged Claims of Racism in Music
20 Theory and Now He's Facing the Music"
21 by Lucinda Breeding Dated August 2,
22 2020, was marked for identification.)

23 BY MR. ALLEN:

24 Q So, Professor Ewell, I -- I'm going to
25 give you some time to look at this, but I want to

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 165

1 just represent for the record that this is an
2 article with the title "A UNT professor challenged
3 claims of racism in music theory and now he's facing
4 the music" by Lucinda Breeding, a journalist, and
5 it's dated August 2, 2020.

6 Did I read that correctly?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Now please examine it.

9 But I really don't want to discuss -- the
10 whole article isn't that relevant to the entire
11 discussion we are having today.

12 But I do want to address points in the
13 article where she quotes you.

14 A Uh-huh.

15 Q So before we do that, do you remember
16 being interviewed by Cindy Breeding?

17 A Lucinda, yeah?

18 Q Correct.

19 A Yeah. Yeah, I think so, yes.

20 Q Do you have any reason to think that she
21 would misquote you in this article?

22 A No, other than it wasn't recorded, as far
23 as I can recall so it's taking notes.

24 Q Did you make any objection to any of the
25 quotations of you in this article to the paper?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 166

1 A Can I -- may I read it?

2 Q You may, but I just want to get these --
3 some -- some general questions out of the way first.

4 A Please, go ahead. Ask again.

5 Q Did you ever object to the journalist or
6 to the paper that you were misquoted?

7 A No.

8 Q Okay. So please go ahead and read. I --
9 and feel free to read the whole thing, but --

10 A Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

11 Q -- on page three of this document, I
12 believe you are mentioned --

13 A Uh-huh.

14 Q -- and quotes by you?

15 A Uh-huh.

16 Q And then -- and so on it goes.

17 THE WITNESS: Can I use this pen?

18 MR. ALLEN: I'm going to ask you not
19 to mark on the exhibit.

20 Perhaps -- I don't want to keep him
21 from making notes, Richard --

22 MR. PAINTER: Okay.

23 MR. ALLEN: -- but I don't want him
24 to mark on the exhibit.

25 THE WITNESS: Can I just --

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 167

1 MR. ALLEN: If you want -- do you
2 mind --

3 MR. PAINTER: You can mark on my
4 copy.

5 THE WITNESS: Can I?

6 MR. ALLEN: And we are actually
7 going to take your notes and enter them
8 into the record, too, just so you know.

9 MR. PAINTER: Yeah.

10 THE WITNESS: I've just got to
11 circle something.

12 MR. ALLEN: Yeah, please.

13 MR. PAINTER: Yeah.

14 THE WITNESS: Okay.

15 MR. ALLEN: Again, this is a
16 conversation for the record. That's why
17 we are doing this.

18 MR. PAINTER: Okay.

19 THE WITNESS: Okay.

20 BY MR. ALLEN:

21 Q So I just want to call your attention to
22 page three --

23 A Uh-huh.

24 Q -- where I believe you're -- you're
25 mentioned with some extensive quotations by the

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 168

1 journalist, Ms. Breeding.

2 You are talking about the -- quote, a
3 white racial frame of music theory; correct?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And there's a relatively lengthy quote
6 from you.

7 A Uh-huh.

8 Q It says, "'In its most abstract form,
9 music theory is not racist,' Ewell said. 'It's
10 talking about music in an analytical way. But I
11 look at this question from the angle of the United
12 States and its history. It takes something as a
13 simple Google search of the country's Naturalization
14 Act of 1790, which is the very first citizenship act
15 in the country and I can sum it up: The
16 Naturalization Act of 1790 said in order to be a
17 citizen of these United States, you've got to be
18 white. Have a nice day.'"

19 Did I read that accurately?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And then it goes on to quote you still
22 further, "'If you think about it from that angle, if
23 you think of American music theory, then it has to
24 be part of that white racial frame,' Ewell said."

25 It goes on, "Quite literally, the people

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 169

1 in the U.S. at that time, the people of color, they
2 weren't important because they weren't white. We
3 shouldn't be fooling ourselves that music theory
4 can't be part of that history. That's as structural
5 and institutional as it gets."

6 Did I read that correctly?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And is it fair to say that's more or less
9 similar to what you've testified to today, this link
10 between the Naturalization Act of 1790 and the white
11 racial frame of music theory?

12 A Not quite.

13 So you -- it seems to me you are trying
14 to draw a direct line between 1790 and 2024 when you
15 say those two things. And --

16 Q I'm just trying to understand what you
17 are saying?

18 A And I'm going to explain that.

19 So without weigh stations every ten to
20 20 years, it's -- it's hard to make that. It -- it
21 doesn't sound -- it sounds nonsensical to say that
22 the first Naturalization Act of 1790 is directly
23 related to music theory's white racial frame. And
24 that is inaccurate.

25 So if you are asking me that it is, my

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 170

1 answer is no, it's not. It's --

2 Q But here you say, "That's as structural
3 and institutional as it gets."

4 Right?

5 MR. PAINTER: He should be allowed
6 to finish --

7 THE WITNESS: Yeah.

8 MR. PAINTER: -- the question --
9 answer.

10 THE WITNESS: Yeah.

11 A And so the -- what's structural and
12 institutional is how over decades and centuries all
13 of these ideas of white superiority --

14 BY MR. ALLEN:

15 Q Uh-huh.

16 A -- and non-white inferiority manifested
17 themselves in many, many ways in our country, as I'm
18 sure we all know here.

19 And ultimately, in my field, music
20 theory, which really became a well defined field in
21 the United States only in the 1960s, obviously very
22 hard for something in 1790 to directly affect
23 something that happened in the 1960s.

24 Absolutely is part of the same white
25 supremacist structures and institutions that have

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 171

1 happened long before, frankly, 1790 in the United
2 States of Am- -- well, in the country that became
3 known as the United States of America.

4 Q Do you have any reason to think that that
5 was misquoted, what Cindy Breeding wrote in this
6 article?

7 A No.

8 Q Can we skip forward to page -- at the
9 bottom, you'll see five of five?

10 A Uh-huh.

11 Q In the middle of that page there's
12 another quote by you and it -- it begins the
13 paragraph before.

14 "Ewell said he has seen some of the
15 tweets about the journal before he 'unplugged.' He
16 hasn't read the rebuttals and doesn't plan to, he
17 said."

18 Did I read that correctly?

19 A Correct.

20 Q Do you understand that to be referring to
21 your engagement with the Twitter comments about the
22 Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

23 A Among other comments, Facebook, and yeah.

24 Q And that's more or less consistent with
25 what you discussed today about your getting off

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 172

1 **Twitter; right?**

2 A Yes. And also I can recall when -- this
3 was kind of blowing up, I think, in July, August of
4 20- --

5 Q Uh-huh?

6 A -- '20. 2020?

7 Q Yeah.

8 A Yeah. Yeah. The pandemic was just
9 starting, yeah. And I can recall I spoke with one
10 journalist, and it might have been this person,
11 actually --

12 Q Uh-huh.

13 A -- when I was unplugged and I was
14 literally upstate with my wife and son.

15 Q And you say here -- or it says here in
16 the article, "He hasn't read the rebuttals and
17 doesn't plan to."

18 Correct?

19 A Uh-huh.

20 Q Is that -- was that accurate at that
21 time?

22 A Yeah.

23 Q And then you are quoted saying, "I won't
24 read them because I will not participate in my own
25 dehumanization."

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 173

1 Did I read that right?

2 A Yeah.

3 Q Is that something you told to the
4 journalist?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And you also say here, "They were
7 incensed by my blackness challenging their
8 whiteness. The Journal of Schenkerian Studies has
9 done far more to damage Schenkerian studies than
10 Schenkerian studies."

11 Did I read that correctly?

12 A You did and that's a bit of a misquote.
13 It doesn't quite read. But --

14 Q But --

15 A -- you get the idea.

16 Q -- what is misquoted?

17 A Well, the Journal of Schenkerian Studies
18 has done -- done far more to damage the field of
19 Schenkerian studies than the field of Schenkerian
20 studies itself.

21 Q That's a good clarification.

22 All right. And did anyone who was
23 connected to the journal ever criticize you for your
24 blackness?

25 A Anyone connected to the journal? So if I

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 174

1 take comments, for instance, from David Beach, who
2 said, "Philip -- my suggestion to Philip Ewell is
3 that he stop complaining about us white guys."

4 Q Who is Philip Beach?

5 A I'm sorry, David Beach --

6 Q David Beach?

7 A -- wrote in response to my nine minute
8 plenary talk, "My advice to Philip Ewell is that he
9 stop complaining about us white guys."

10 That would probably fall under the rubric
11 of being incensed by my blackness.

12 Q Did he mention your blackness or just
13 said you shouldn't complain about his whiteness?

14 A Did David Beach mention my blackness? I
15 would have to go back to his actual report.

16 Q And at that time you hadn't read those
17 reports, had you?

18 A Correct.

19 Q At this time had anyone from the journal
20 expressly criticized you for being black?

21 A No.

22 Q And you did say that you would not
23 participate in your own dehumanization; right?

24 A Correct.

25 Q You didn't say "demeaning" you or

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 175

1 anything like that here?

2 A Correct.

3 Q So you seem to know what that word meant
4 at this time; right?

5 A I've always known what dehumanization
6 means, Mr. Allen.

7 Q Did you equivocate about the meaning of
8 that word with the journalist at this time?

9 A No.

10 Q And you basically said you weren't going
11 to read the Journal of Schenkerian Studies symposium
12 in 2020; right?

13 A Correct.

14 Q So that would suggest that had they
15 reached out to you personally, you wouldn't have
16 participated; right?

17 A No. Because that's kind of -- you are
18 conflating, like, the timeline here.

19 Had they reached out to me in a -- in a
20 expedient fashion before publication of this journal
21 issue, I most likely would have been very interested
22 in being part of a colloquy because I believe in
23 collegiality and -- and respect among colleagues.

24 To post factum, after the journal comes
25 out, to try to engage me in a response of sorts,

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 176

1 that is -- I'm uninterested in.

2 Q And yet you didn't raise that with Ellen
3 Bakulina?

4 A I -- I already said that when I responded
5 to Ellen Bakulina, I simply said -- she said, Do you
6 have any questions about these responses?

7 I said, No, I have no questions. Have a
8 nice day.

9 Q Did you raise the issue of not being
10 invited with the journalist?

11 A No. To my knowledge, no.

12 Q If that was so important to you at the
13 time, why didn't you raise that with the journalist
14 when you were explaining your dehumanization?

15 A You know, back in 2020 a lot of things
16 were happening so it wasn't like I was laser focused
17 on one thing.

18 This one little aspect of a lack of
19 industry -- industry standard following the -- the
20 rules of inviting people to whom you are responding.

21 So in a brief ten-minute phone call
22 probably with this journalist, no, I did not bring
23 that up.

24 Q Did you bring up your other complaint
25 that there were articles that weren't peer reviewed,

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 177

1 to your knowledge?

2 A To my knowledge, no. I don't think so.

3 Q How about the anonymous publication?

4 A I don't think so. I don't think so.

5 Q You were aware that people published in
6 the symposium who supported your point of view in
7 your plenary talk of 2019; correct?

8 A Only in the sense that two of them had
9 reached out to me to -- to let me know that they
10 were going to submit something and I -- I read it
11 before it was even approved for publication.

12 And those are the pieces by Richard
13 Beaudoin and Chris Seegal.

14 Q Uh-huh.

15 A And it was clear from what I wrote that
16 they were supportive of some of the points I was
17 making.

18 Q Did that dehumanize you?

19 A I don't think so, no.

20 Q And was that in any way improper as an
21 academic professional?

22 A No.

23 Q Your full length article --

24 (Whereupon, the court reporter
25 requests clarification.)

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 178

1 BY MR. ALLEN:

2 Q Your full length article in Music Theory
3 Online, I think you've said this before but if you
4 could just remind us, when did that come out?

5 A I'm going to say June 2020.

6 Q So it came out right before the Journal
7 of Schenkerian Studies published the symposium in
8 July of 2020, to your knowledge?

9 A To be honest, I don't know which came out
10 first.

11 Q Okay. Do you have any reason to believe
12 that Timothy Jackson was solely responsible for not
13 inviting you to participate?

14 A No, I have no reason to believe that.

15 Q You were aware that more than one person
16 worked on the journal's editorial staff; correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Do you know of any reason that Timothy
19 Jackson alone should have been made responsible for
20 the whole editorial staff?

21 A No.

22 MR. ALLEN: Now, I'm going to mark
23 for the record, the next exhibit is
24 Exhibit 6. This will fit in the
25 category -- and I obviously don't want

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 179

1 you to read all of these -- we'll go to
2 selective portions of it and I'll explain
3 what this is --

4 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

5 MR. ALLEN: -- in a second.

6 I'm going to give this to you also,
7 Richard.

8 I'm marking for the record
9 Exhibit 6.

10 (Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 6,
11 Collection of Documents Submitted by
12 Timothy Jackson to Ad Hoc Panel
13 Convened at University of North
14 Texas, was marked for
15 identification.)

16 BY MR. ALLEN:

17 Q Now, I'm going to direct your attention
18 to the cover page -- or the first page, I should
19 say.

20 A Uh-huh.

21 Q And I'm just going to represent to you --
22 because obviously this is not an e-mail to you --
23 this is a collection of documents which was
24 submitted by Timothy Jackson to the, quote, ad hoc
25 panel which was convened at the University of

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 180

1 North Texas to basically investigate Timothy Jackson
2 and his role in the Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

3 MR. WALTON: Mr. Allen, what --

4 MR. ALLEN: Yes, Ben.

5 MR. WALTON: What document did you
6 end up labeling Exhibit 6 here?

7 MR. ALLEN: Appreciate the
8 clarification and I apologize. This was
9 011UNT2645.

10 MR. WALTON: Thank you.

11 MR. ALLEN: No, thank you, Ben.

12 BY MR. ALLEN:

13 Q So you'll look at the bottom,
14 Professor Ewell.

15 Do you see there's a page marking
16 UNT02645?

17 A -002645, yes.

18 Q Correct. I'm just going to tell you,
19 those are Bates numbers.

20 A Uh-huh.

21 Q These are numbers that attorneys assign
22 to documents produced in discovery. It's a
23 continuous series throughout the record in this
24 case.

25 A Uh-huh.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 181

1 Q I will be referring to them as basically
2 equivalent of page numbers.

3 A Okay.

4 Q On the other hand, that's the sole
5 alteration of this document by the attorneys.

6 A Okay.

7 Q It's a -- it's a document that was
8 produced by the University of North Texas, thus the
9 abbreviation "UNT."

10 So with that understood, I'm just going
11 to call your attention to various parts of this
12 record.

13 These were documents that were disclosed
14 to the ad hoc panel by Timothy Jackson to disclose
15 simply the internal workings of the journal that led
16 to the publication of the symposium?

17 A Uh-huh.

18 Q I'm not asking you to comment on whether
19 that's true, but I'm just going to ask you to assume
20 that for the record. All right?

21 So can I direct your attention to
22 page UNT2663, please?

23 This is a copy of an e-mail dated
24 December 31st, 2019.

25 Did I read that correctly?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 182

1 A The second one, yeah.

2 Q Sorry, the one at the bottom of the page?

3 A Uh-huh.

4 Q Correct?

5 A Uh-huh.

6 Q And it seems to be from someone named Bob

7 Kosovsky?

8 A Uh-huh.

9 Q The thing I want to ask you about is the

10 "to" line, SMT-announce@societymusictheory.org.

11 Do you recognize that e-mail?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Can you explain for the record what that

14 e-mail is?

15 A It's a Listserv where music theorists

16 make announcements.

17 Q And would you have received that e-mail?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And in fact I think you've testified you

20 did receive that e-mail?

21 A Correct.

22 Q And this has the caption in the first

23 line, "The Journal of Schenkerian Studies Volume 12

24 2019 Call for Papers."

25 Right?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 183

1 A Correct.

2 Q If I could ask you to just review that
3 through the next page.

4 And I was just going to ask if this is
5 the call for papers that was sent out over the SMT
6 Listserv, to the best of your knowledge?

7 A Yes, to the best of my knowledge. Yeah.

8 Q So to the extent that you've testified
9 today that you didn't receive an invitation to
10 participate in the Journal of Schenkerian Studies
11 Volume 12, it's not because you weren't asked
12 through this Listserv; it's because you weren't
13 asked in the way that you would have preferred and
14 thought of as industry standards?

15 A Well, when you say, "would have preferred
16 or thought of," I would go a step further and say in
17 22 years, I've never heard of a general Listserv
18 announcement making a call for papers tried to be
19 substituted for a specific invitation to a person
20 who -- whose work has been under scrutiny in
21 responses as my work was with the Journal of
22 Schenkerian Studies Volume 12.

23 In fact, I would go so far as to say is
24 that is so far outside of industry standards to --
25 to think that this somehow represents an invitation

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 184

1 to Philip Ewell, a direct invitation to
2 Philip Ewell, that that is a very strange thing
3 indeed.

4 Q Now, I never said that it was a --
5 somehow a direct invitation to you, but you did
6 receive it; right?

7 A I received it.

8 Q It's an invitation to participate;
9 correct?

10 A Not to me specifically.

11 Q You specifically received it on a
12 Listserv that you subscribe to; correct?

13 A Yeah, but thousands of people probably
14 received that.

15 Q And you didn't respond to it, in fact;
16 right?

17 A Along with -- along with other thousands
18 of people that didn't respond, yeah. In fact, if I
19 could say, Listservs aren't meant to be responded
20 to.

21 Q The statement that you never received an
22 invitation to participate in the Journal of
23 Schenkerian Studies, which was made repeatedly at
24 this time, was false, however; correct?

25 A No, I disagree.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 185

1 Q You disagree that this announcement was
2 an invitation which you received to participate in
3 the Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

4 A Not --

5 MR. PAINTER: Could you clarify who
6 the announcement came from? Did this
7 come from the Journal of Schenkerian
8 Studies?

9 BY MR. ALLEN:

10 Q Do you see where it says, "forwarded
11 message from" on page -2663?

12 This is a question for you, Professor
13 Ewell.

14 A Oh, I see. Yes, I --

15 Q Do you see the cc line, Levi Walls,
16 LeviWalls@MyUNT.edu?

17 A Uh-huh.

18 Q And it says, "Forwarded message from:
19 Levi Walls," the same e-mail, "LeviWalls@MyUNT.edu.
20 Correct? Did I read that right?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Do you know who Levi Walls is?

23 A He was one of the student editors, I
24 believe, of the journal issue.

25 Q And do you know who Bob Kosovsky is?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 186

1 A I -- I know the name. I think he's
2 somebody at SMT. He might have been a -- like an
3 executive director of the Society for Music Theory,
4 but I --

5 Q And do you --

6 A -- I don't think I've ever met him.

7 Q And do you have any reason to believe
8 that this wasn't a message, the call for papers,
9 forwarded to the SMT-announce list by Levi Walls?

10 A I think it was such a message.

11 Q Okay. And you received it, which we've
12 already discussed?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And it is an invitation to participate in
15 the journal; correct?

16 A Yes.

17 Q It's just not the one that you wanted?

18 A It's not the one that anybody who
19 actually -- whose work is under scrutiny would
20 expect. It's just not what happens. It never
21 happens that way.

22 Q Did this call for papers dehumanize you?

23 A I can't comment on that.

24 Q Does that -- you can't comment on it
25 because it's not true or it is true and you don't

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 187

1 want to comment on it?

2 A Just because I -- it's a very difficult
3 thing to think about. I'd have to think about
4 whether it dehumanized me.

5 I -- I hesitate to say whether it
6 dehumanized me.

7 What I would prefer to say is that this
8 is not the way colloquies or symposia happen in
9 academia.

10 Q Do you find anything objectionable --
11 objectionable about the call for papers itself?

12 A Actually, if I remember, they just had
13 mis- -- mis- -- misquoted something I said, but it's
14 so -- it's so minimal that -- that I don't -- I
15 wouldn't really raise any objection.

16 Something here written is not exactly
17 what I said at that plenary session. And that's
18 what happens of course when you take a plenary
19 session.

20 Q I want to talk about the role of two
21 individuals at the University of North Texas: One
22 is a defendant named Benjamin Graf and the other is
23 someone we've already discussed in -- a little bit
24 named Levi Walls. Let me start with Mr. Graf.

25 Who is Benjamin Graf?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 188

1 A Ben Graf was the other student -- to my
2 knowledge, to my recollection, the other student
3 editor of the journal issue, Levi Walls and Ben
4 Graf.

5 I think that they were both mentioned in
6 that ad hoc panel, which is when I found out, if --
7 if I remember correctly, that they were in fact the
8 student editors.

9 And, of course, Timothy Jackson and
10 Stephen Slottow were also mentioned in that ad hoc
11 panel as the editorial advisors, I think, the
12 faculty, and the editors, the -- the two graduate
13 students, Levi Walls and Ben Graf.

14 And what else about Ben Graf? He -- I
15 presumed that both students were graduate students
16 working with Schenkerian studies, potentially with
17 one of two faculty advisors.

18 Q Uh-huh.

19 A Excuse me.

20 That's my recollection of -- of Ben Graf.

21 Q So did you know Ben Graf before this
22 episode in late 2020?

23 A I do not think so, no.

24 Q Were you aware that Benjamin Graf was on
25 faculty at University of North Texas at this time?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 189

1 A No, I thought he was a grad student.

2 Q And had you had any contact with him when
3 he was the editor of the Journal of Schenkerian
4 Studies?

5 A Somebody sent me -- after the issue came
6 out, I think one of those two people, Levi Walls or
7 Ben Graf, sent me a PDF of the journal issue because
8 I had not been sent a copy --

9 Q Uh-huh.

10 A -- physical or otherwise.

11 And I do remember, I think -- I think on
12 a Twitter direct message hearing from one or both of
13 them just kind of explaining, saying, I'm sorry this
14 happened.

15 Because it, you know, it had blown up, to
16 a large extent.

17 And -- and me replying, It's okay.

18 I mean, it's --

19 Q Uh-huh.

20 A These things happen, I guess, yeah.

21 Q Do you remember the exact words that
22 either of them used?

23 A No, I do not.

24 Q Okay. And I believe from your testimony
25 today you've deleted your Twitter account?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 190

1 A Yes.

2 Q So those are no longer retrievable?

3 A Not by me.

4 Q Now, I asked -- I asked you about
5 Benjamin Graf.

6 But let me ask the same question about
7 Levi Walls, although I know you've answered some of
8 that.

9 What was your understanding of the role
10 in -- of Levi Walls in the journal in July of 2020?

11 A I -- i thought he was a graduate student
12 editor of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies, as I
13 thought Ben Graf was, too.

14 Q Have you met with Benjamin Graf since
15 that time?

16 A I saw Ben Graf at the Pedagogy into
17 Practice conference that happened not too long ago.

18 And as far as I know, that's the first
19 time I've ever met him in person. And we had lunch
20 with a big group of people.

21 Q Did he talk about the Journal of
22 Schenkerian Studies with you at all at that lunch?

23 A He did not.

24 Q What did you talk about, if I may ask?

25 A Music theory pedagogy. There were six of

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 191

1 us at a table and we had a nice lunch.

2 We talked about these issues -- I
3 imagine -- I mean, I knew the name from the ad hoc
4 panel and also he -- he -- he's still at University
5 of North Texas, I think, Ben Graf.

6 So -- but I think he knew that he, you
7 know, wasn't to -- I -- I -- I presume that he was
8 told by someone, Don't talk with people about this
9 and with Philip Ewell either.

10 So that's not something I pried and I
11 wouldn't want to.

12 Q Did he tell you that?

13 A Oh, I can't recall. I can't recall
14 whether we even mentioned the Journal of Schenkerian
15 Studies, to be honest.

16 But I do remember that there was no
17 substantive conversation.

18 Q Okay.

19 MR. ALLEN: I'm going to mark for
20 the record Exhibit 7.

21 COURT REPORTER: One moment.

22 If I could, sir.

23 MR. ALLEN: Uh-huh.

24 (Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 7,
25 Facebook Exchange, One-Page Document

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 192

1 Dated July 25, 2020, was marked for
2 identification.)

3 COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

4 BY MR. ALLEN:

5 Q And while you are reviewing that, it's a
6 one-page document which seems to be the printout of
7 a Facebook exchange; is that correct?

8 A Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

9 Q And it's dated July 25th, 2020.

10 MR. ALLEN: I'm going to inform the
11 people online here that it's marked in
12 your exhibit pack as 03UNT0441.

13 And you'll see that Bates stamp in
14 the lower right-hand corner but it may
15 not be legible because it's printed black
16 on black.

17 BY MR. ALLEN:

18 Q So is this a message you remember getting
19 via Facebook?

20 A I certainly do now, yes. Uh-huh.

21 Q And that's your, I guess, avatar there,
22 the -- the charming fellow playing the cello?

23 A Correct. Yeah.

24 Q And Benjamin Graf said to you, "At this
25 time, the JSS would likely welcome a response from

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 193

1 you."

2 Right?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And JSS stands for Journal of Schenkerian
5 Studies?

6 A Uh-huh.

7 Q Was that dehumanizing?

8 A No.

9 Q And then he says he felt -- or, "We felt
10 uneasy about the situation from the beginning."

11 Do you see where he says that in the next
12 sentence after --

13 A Uh-huh.

14 Q Did you have any discussion with him
15 about how he felt so-called uneasy from this
16 beginning?

17 A No.

18 Q He also claimed to get, quote,
19 significant pressure from the advisory board.

20 Do you see that?

21 A I'd like to find it here.

22 MR. PAINTER: In the middle here.

23 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh. Okay.

24 A Uh-huh. Yes. Go.

25

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 194

1 BY MR. ALLEN:

2 Q Did he ever explain what he meant by
3 that?

4 A No, not to my recollection, no.

5 Q If you skip down a few sentences, do you
6 see the sentence that says, "I really enjoy
7 reading"?

8 A Uh-huh.

9 Q It says -- he said to you here, "I really
10 enjoy reading your blog post and the JSS advisors
11 mentioned asking you about a response after your
12 planned visit to UNT."

13 Did I read that right?

14 A Correct.

15 Q Were you planning to visit the University
16 of North Texas around this time?

17 A Not around this time.

18 Q What is he referring to when he says,
19 "your planned visit"?

20 A The planned visit was to have happened a
21 year roughly beyond this. I think the fall -- if
22 this is 2020, this -- I think the fall of 2021,
23 perhaps, it was planned.

24 Q The -- your visit, you mean?

25 A Correct.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 195

1 Q Ah.

2 A And it was -- it was about Russian music
3 theory, which is -- I'm a Russianist. That's
4 what --

5 Q Sure. Sure.

6 A -- that's my field.

7 Q And did that visit take place?

8 A It did not.

9 Q Why is that?

10 A I cancelled it.

11 Q Why did you cancel it?

12 A Because I didn't want to go down to the
13 University of North Texas.

14 Q Why?

15 A Because this was blowing up and I didn't
16 want to be part of it.

17 Q It was specifically because of the
18 publication of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies
19 Volume 12?

20 A Among other things happening around this,
21 yeah.

22 Q So there was no opportunity for JSS
23 advisors to ask you about a response at that visit?

24 A After the journal issue had come out, no.

25 Q And your response here in the gray bubble

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 196

1 is, "Thanks, Ben. I understand the difficult
2 position you were in. Yes, the next time we meet,
3 I'd be happy to get a coffee. Best, Phil."

4 Right?

5 A Correct.

6 Q And it sounds like you actually did meet
7 for dinner?

8 A Lunch, yeah.

9 Q Lunch? Okay.

10 A Uh-huh.

11 Q What did you understand by the difficult
12 position that Benjamin Graf was in?

13 A Well, graduate students -- and I thought
14 he was a graduate student -- I think he had been a
15 graduate student at the University of North Texas
16 right prior to this.

17 But even so, I thought he was a graduate
18 student, like Levi Walls, are under enormous
19 pressure if they are caught between the faculty
20 and -- and outward-facing scholarship, such as a
21 journal.

22 So it's very difficult to walk that line.
23 That's what I was referring to.

24 Q And having met Benjamin Graf in person,
25 do you think of him as a weak person?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 197

1 A I don't know him well enough to comment
2 on that.

3 Q Do you think of him as in any way an
4 uncourageous person?

5 A Again, I -- I just don't know him well
6 enough -- well enough to comment on that.

7 Q In your experience of meeting him in
8 person, did you have any reason to believe that he
9 was lacking in courage in any way?

10 A It was one lunch with five other people
11 at the table. I really can't comment on that.

12 Q And you've already testified that you
13 thought he was a graduate student, not on faculty;
14 right?

15 A Correct.

16 Q The fact that he was on faculty, does
17 that change any of your testimony?

18 A No. Because there are, as you know,
19 many, many levels of faculty rank and levels of
20 vulnerability.

21 And I was presuming at the time, and I
22 think accurately, that he was a graduate student.

23 But if he were in fact faculty, I'm
24 pretty sure that he was not a tenured faculty,
25 because tenure is what actually gives you power at a

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 198

1 university. So anyone who is not tenured walks a
2 very fine line.

3 Q Do you know if Benjamin Graf benefited
4 from editing the Journal of Schenkerian Studies in
5 terms of advancing his career?

6 A I imagine that there's some small
7 benefits, yeah, of -- of being listed as an editor
8 of a journal, yeah.

9 Q He also says something here, you know, in
10 the middle of this post or exchange with you, "We
11 tried to distance ourselves from some of the content
12 of the responses as a result, but as you well know,
13 silence is complicity and I sincerely apologize for
14 that."

15 Did I read that correctly into the
16 record?

17 A Yes.

18 Q What did you understand by this phrase,
19 "silence is complicity"?

20 A I imagine since I had only seen a few of
21 the postings like on -- like on Twitter about some
22 of the content, that someone could have been saying
23 something at some point about some of the commentary
24 that was getting some pushback that we shouldn't be
25 publishing X, Y, or Z; right?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 199

1 Q Uh-huh.

2 A And I presume that's what Ben is talking
3 about when he says, "silence is complicity."

4 Q Was keeping silence about these
5 supposedly improper methods for contacting you also
6 complicity in the Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

7 A No.

8 Q So about this engagement that you, I
9 guess, cancelled to visit the University of
10 North Texas, is that a -- is that standard
11 professional comportment to cancel an engagement
12 you've already made to visit another school and --

13 A No.

14 Q -- give a talk?

15 A No.

16 Q If I could refer you back to Exhibit
17 Number 6, that's the rather thick packet?

18 A Uh-huh.

19 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, Mr. Allen,
20 could I get a bathroom break?

21 MR. ALLEN: Oh, absolutely.

22 THE WITNESS: Yeah.

23 MR. ALLEN: And there's no question
24 on --

25 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 200

1 MR. ALLEN: -- so let's go off the
2 record.

3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off
4 the record. The time is 2:41.

5 (Whereupon, there was a recess taken
6 from 2:41 p.m. to 2:48 p.m.)

7 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going back
8 on the record. The time is 2:48.

9 BY MR. ALLEN:

10 Q So, Professor Ewell, I'm going to ask you
11 some questions about things that are in the
12 contemporaneous documents of the journal only for
13 the purpose of asking what you know about things
14 that are said about either your talk or the
15 individual's relationships to you and things like
16 that.

17 A Uh-huh.

18 Q So I'm going to ask that you look at
19 2657, UNT2657?

20 A Uh-huh.

21 Q This is an e-mail by your colleague, the
22 defendant, Ellen Bak- -- Bakulina --

23 A Uh-huh.

24 Q -- on December 1st, 2019.

25 Do you see that?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 201

1 A Uh-huh.

2 Q And I just want to direct your attention
3 to the first sentence.

4 It says, "I just had a conversation with
5 a colleague about the SMT plenary session of which
6 Ewell's talk was a part and he told me that I should
7 have known all along -- told me what I should have
8 known all along because this was announced right
9 before the presentations that the plenary talks will
10 be published in Music Theory Spectrum."

11 Did I read that correctly?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And is -- does that comport with your
14 memory of how that worked, that they were always
15 meant to be published in Spectrum from the get go?

16 A No, I did actually -- I did not know that
17 back in 2019.

18 Q So that, as you understood it, is not an
19 accurate statement?

20 A Well, accurate for Ellen. Let me reread
21 it, what -- what you just wrote [sic].

22 Not an accurate statement from me. I
23 didn't know that it was going to be published in
24 Music Theory Spectrum in 2019. I had never given a
25 plenary talk before November 2019.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 202

1 Q So if you skip down to -2657 at the
2 bottom there --

3 A Uh-huh.

4 Q -- there's some sort of "from Ellen
5 Bakulina"?

6 A Uh-huh.

7 Q Then it goes forward.

8 It says, "Dear Ellen, hyphen" -- or,
9 excuse me -- "comma, colleagues, comma."

10 And that appears to be an e-mail signed
11 by Timothy Jackson.

12 Do you see that one that spills over to
13 the next page, UNT02658?

14 A To Levi Walls, to Timothy Jackson,
15 Benjamin Graf, Stephen Slottow, Diego Cubero, and
16 it's from Timothy Jackson?

17 Q Well, it's -- it's not entirely clear
18 here, but if you see at the bottom, it says, "Best,
19 Tim," at the bottom of the e-mail?

20 A Of the next page, yeah.

21 Q Yes.

22 A Okay. Yeah.

23 Q So this message, "All things considered,
24 JSS" --

25 A Uh-huh.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 203

1 Q -- "should go forward with the call as
2 planned"?

3 Right?

4 A Okay.

5 Q Now, if we -- if we look up to the
6 previous e-mail which we were just talking about,
7 Ellen Bakulina says in her last sentence, "Does the
8 prospective Spectrum publication means that" -- I
9 guess that's a typo -- "means that perhaps we should
10 wait with our call for responses until after that
11 publication appears."

12 Did I read that right?

13 A Yes.

14 Q So they are addressing that within the
15 journal?

16 A Uh-huh.

17 Q Timothy writes this next e-mail, "The JSS
18 should go forward with the call as planned"?

19 A Uh-huh.

20 Q Right?

21 And then do you see right under that,
22 Benjamin Graf on December 2nd, 2019, in the morning,
23 9:14 a.m. --

24 A Uh-huh.

25 Q -- writes, "I agree with Tim"?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 204

1 A Uh-huh.

2 Q Right?

3 A Uh-huh.

4 Q Did Benjamin Graf ever discuss with you
5 agreeing that the call should go forward?

6 A No.

7 Q Is that consistent in your view with him
8 being pressured?

9 A No, not pressured.

10 Q Does it look like he's opposing the
11 publication --

12 A No.

13 Q -- of some special symposium?

14 A No.

15 Q And, again, these were records disclosed
16 to the so-called ad hoc panel.

17 A Uh-huh.

18 Q That's why I'm presenting it to you. All
19 right.

20 Do you remember in July 27, 2020 an
21 apology posted by Levi Walls on Facebook?

22 A I -- I'm -- I wouldn't deny it existed.
23 I don't recall it.

24 Q Let me ask it this way: Do you have no
25 memory of it now as you sit here today because you

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 205

1 think you didn't read it?

2 A I -- if it were posted as a general
3 Facebook post, it's entirely possible I did not read
4 it.

5 If it were a direct message to me which I
6 would have found because I did -- I digged -- dug --
7 I dug -- digged -- I dug in my Facebook direct
8 messages --

9 Q Yes.

10 A -- and I would have found it, I presume.
11 So the -- I rarely read Facebook posts.

12 Q Okay.

13 A Although back then I was reading them
14 slightly more often than I -- certainly than I do
15 now.

16 Q Yes.

17 MR. ALLEN: I'm going to mark for
18 the record -- record as Exhibit 8 a
19 Facebook post by Levi Walls.

20 (Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 8,
21 Facebook Post by Levi Walls, was
22 marked for identification.)

23 BY MR. ALLEN:

24 Q And I just have one question, given your
25 previous answers to my questions.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 206

1 I just want you to look at this, maybe
2 briefly, and tell me if you remember reading this at
3 the time?

4 A Sure.

5 MR. WALTON: Which document is this,
6 Mr. Allen?

7 MR. ALLEN: Thank you. I was going
8 to just say that.

9 This is also marked 08 Jackson 0234.

10 MR. WALTON: Thanks.

11 THE WITNESS: Okay.

12 BY MR. ALLEN:

13 Q So just, again, did you ever read this at
14 the time?

15 A I think I did.

16 Q And in that case, you knew at that time,
17 this date being dated July 27th, 2020; correct?

18 A Uh-huh. Yeah.

19 Q -- that Levi Walls, who you formerly
20 testified you knew, was a graduate student working
21 on the journal --

22 A Uh-huh.

23 Q -- was claiming to have no control over
24 the content of the journal; right?

25 A That's what it says here, yeah. I kind

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 207

1 of skimmed through it, yes.

2 Q If you skip down to Jackson -235, that's
3 the second page of this Exhibit Number 8?

4 A Uh-huh.

5 Q There's a second sentence that begins on
6 the page, "However, after Philip Ewell's SMT
7 presentation, Timothy Jackson decided that it was
8 the responsibility of the journal to 'protect
9 Schenkerian analysis.'"

10 Then he says, "Although, after serious
11 thought, I essentially agreed with Ewell's talk, it
12 was not up to me what did or did not go into the
13 journal."

14 Did I read that correctly?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Is that your understanding at the time of
17 what had happened inside the journal?

18 A Among other things.

19 Q Okay. Well, and I just want to focus on
20 this thing for now.

21 A Uh-huh.

22 Q So now if I could get you to go back to
23 Exhibit 6, that's the big packet?

24 A Uh-huh.

25 Q And go to UNT2705.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 208

1 There's an e-mail at the bottom of that
2 page that says, "Walls, Levi," it gives his e-mail.
3 And it says, "to me," meaning to Timothy Jackson.

4 Do you see that?

5 A Uh-huh.

6 Q Could I ask you to review that e-mail?

7 A Uh-huh.

8 This is -2705, Bates number?

9 Q UNT02705?

10 A Uh-huh.

11 Q An e-mail beginning on the bottom of that
12 page dated November 15th, 2019?

13 A Uh-huh.

14 Okay.

15 Q So this e-mail says in the second
16 sentence that begins in that e-mail addressing
17 Timothy Jackson, "You've likely heard about it" --
18 referring to a particular Schenker paper from SMT --
19 "as it caused quite a stir. I was very ambivalent
20 about it because it suggested that analysis that
21 utilizes levels of hierarchy is inherently racist
22 which strikes me as naive."

23 Did I read that correctly?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Do you understand this to be referring to

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 209

1 your paper at the SMT?

2 A I think so.

3 Q Does that sound like someone who agreed
4 with your paper?

5 A Agreed but misunderstood. "Inherently
6 racist" is not something I would say, but yeah.

7 Q So does that seem to suggest that he was
8 lying in his Facebook post on July 27th, 2020?

9 A No, because this is November 2019, after
10 my talk -- a week after my talk. And the 2020
11 Facebook that you just referenced was after the
12 publication of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies.

13 And apparently, Levi Walls had worked on
14 that so had been kind of deeply involved in it. So
15 clearly he changed some opinions.

16 Q Don't you think he changed his opinions
17 because the journal was attacked by almost every
18 single academic in the SMT?

19 A I disagree. I don't think every single
20 academic attacked the journal.

21 So that's -- that's -- to answer your
22 question -- can you state the question again?

23 Q You don't think that Levi Walls was
24 posting an apologia on Facebook because the journal
25 was being attacked as racist?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 210

1 A No.

2 Q You don't think Levi Walls was
3 misrepresenting his actual true feelings about your
4 work because the entire Society for Music Theory had
5 published an open letter condemning the Journal of
6 Schenkerian Studies?

7 A You say "entire Society for Music Theory"
8 and it wasn't. It was 900 signatories. So they
9 don't speak for absolutely 100 percent of the
10 membership, obviously.

11 And I don't believe that Levi Walls was
12 misrepresenting his beliefs. I believe that they
13 had changed, just from the two documents you showed
14 me.

15 Q He never said he changed his beliefs, did
16 he?

17 A Well, something changed, did they -- did
18 they not -- did it not?

19 Q Yeah, the thing that changed was the
20 Journal of Schenkerian Studies came under attack;
21 right?

22 MR. PAINTER: Do you have a
23 question?

24 A Yeah, is there a question there?

25

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 211

1 BY MR. ALLEN:

2 Q Did you understand my question?

3 MR. ALLEN: Could you read back the
4 question to the witness?

5 (Whereupon, the referred-to text was
6 read back by the court reporter.)

7 BY MR. ALLEN:

8 Q Is that question unclear to you?

9 A No, it's not unclear. It's just a
10 question of whether I agree with it or not.

11 The Journal of Schenkerian Studies came
12 under attack -- okay. Fair. I'll go ahead and say
13 yes.

14 Q Thank you.

15 Could I direct your attention to
16 UNT02707? That's the -- the next -- I want -- I
17 know this is causing you to jump around.

18 A Uh-huh.

19 Q But, again, these were documents provided
20 to the so-called ad hoc panel convened to --

21 A Uh-huh.

22 Q -- investigate my client.

23 A Uh-huh.

24 Q Do you see an e-mail at the bottom of
25 that page from Monday, November 18th, 2019?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 212

1 A Yes.

2 Q And, again, this would have been within
3 plus or minus a week of your talk; right?

4 A A week, two weeks, yeah.

5 Q Okay. And again it's by Levi Walls?

6 A Uh-huh.

7 Q Okay.

8 A After -- after the talk. Let's not --
9 not plus or minus. It's after, plus.

10 Q Correct.

11 Levi Walls writes to Dr. Jackson.

12 Did I characterize that correctly?

13 A It just says to me.

14 Q Do you see it says, "Dear Dr. Jackson"?

15 A Correct. Okay. Yes.

16 Q And it says at the end, "Regards, Levi"?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And then he goes on in the second
19 paragraph that begins in this e-mail, "Yes, the
20 paper's willful ignorance of Schenker's Jewish
21 identity is indeed troubling. That seems to mark it
22 as implicitly antisemitic at the very least. I
23 think that had he limited his criticisms to
24 Schenker, the man, it would have been slightly less
25 problematic. But his claim that the entire

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 213

1 theoretical world view and, by extension, those who
2 help spread it, is racist becomes very problematic
3 when we consider the intimate connection between
4 Schenkerian analysis and the Jewish identity."

5 And then he ends that paragraph, "Ewell's
6 talk certainly failed in that regard."

7 Do you see that?

8 A Uh-huh.

9 Q So, again, is this consistent with a
10 graduate student who agrees with your talk?

11 A In November of 2019, it is.

12 Q You think this indicates his agreement
13 with your talk?

14 A Oh no. No. No. No. I think that this
15 does not in- -- indicate agreement.

16 Q Okay.

17 A I think that he had some qualms about my
18 talk in November of 2019.

19 I also would just point out the
20 misreading that the entire theoretical world view is
21 racist.

22 It's a common misquotation attributed to
23 me. I've seen it many times. But it's not true.
24 I've never said that.

25 And -- it -- I would love to see somebody

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 214

1 actually point to where I wrote that because they
2 would be looking for a very long time.

3 Q Have you ever sought out Mr. Walls to
4 discuss your work?

5 A No.

6 Q Has he ever sought out you to discuss
7 your work?

8 A Again, a direct message?

9 There were a lot of -- a lot of
10 communications going back and forth.

11 I don't remember seeing -- I mean, in my
12 Facebook direct messages, I searched.

13 Q Uh-huh.

14 A And that was a search term. So I -- did
15 I have something in my Facebook direct messages?

16 I mean, you -- you looked at it. I -- I
17 can't recall.

18 And it's possible that if it's not there,
19 that it -- there was a Twitter direct message.
20 Probably it would have happened in one of those two
21 places if I had any contact with Levi Walls.

22 Q And so to sum up, you don't recall that
23 ever happening?

24 A Correct.

25 Q Okay. Let me ask you to jump to --

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 215

1 A May I -- may I -- may I --

2 Q Please.

3 A -- qualify?

4 I gave a talk -- a remote talk in Florida
5 and -- and Levi Walls was also giving a talk at some
6 point.

7 And I recall, I -- it must have been from
8 my Hunter e-mail because virtually all of these
9 communications were professional and from my Hunter
10 e-mail.

11 I recall writing Levi Walls just saying,
12 I see you are giving a talk in Florida.

13 Q Uh-huh.

14 A I look forward to listening to it.

15 I don't think I was actually able to
16 attend his --

17 Q Uh-huh.

18 A -- his virtual talk.

19 Q Uh-huh.

20 A And I also don't know whether he attended
21 my virtual talk because it -- it wasn't one -- I
22 don't think it was one where all the Zoom windows
23 were available.

24 Q Right.

25 A Even if it was, as a -- as a keynote

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 216

1 speaker I don't pay attention --

2 Q Of course.

3 A -- to the -- the Zoom gallery.

4 But I just want -- since we are talking
5 about Levi Walls, I did have -- I think I instigated
6 an e-mail saying, I see you're giving a talk. I
7 look forward to hearing your talk.

8 And that's what it was.

9 Q There was no more substantive discussion
10 between you about that?

11 A About -- that's correct.

12 Q Okay. Could I ask you to skip to
13 UNT02708?

14 There's an e-mail here from Timothy
15 Jackson to Mr. Levi Walls dated November 19th, 2019?

16 A Uh-huh.

17 Q And it appears to be from Timothy
18 Jackson?

19 He says, "Dear Levi, It occurred to me
20 that it might be appropriate for the journal to
21 solicit responsible -- responses to Ewell from a
22 number of prominent Schenkerians."

23 Did I --

24 A Correct.

25 Q -- read that --

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 217

1 Now, it's relatively long and I don't
2 want to spend that time on it.

3 But if we skip down to the next page,
4 there's a response from Levi Walls; right?

5 And this is November 19th, 2019 at
6 3:16 p.m.?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And he writes, "Dear Dr. Jackson, I agree
9 that a response in the JSS would be very
10 appropriate. It would be nice to have it for the
11 upcoming issue, although it is very forthcoming
12 around mid-December. A response in Issue 13 would
13 of course be quite late. Did you have any
14 particular Schenkerians in mind? Dr. Graf and I can
15 discuss some candidates tomorrow at our weekly
16 meeting and get requests out as early as tomorrow
17 evening."

18 Did I read that right?

19 A Yes.

20 Q Does that sound like someone who has no
21 control over the content of the journal?

22 A No.

23 Q One of Levi Walls' claims was that he was
24 instructed by Timothy Jackson, something like, to --
25 to censor people who were in favor of your paper.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 218

1 Do you recall anything to that effect?

2 A No.

3 Q Let me direct your attention to UNT02758.

4 This time we'll be looking to the top of the page.

5 But before I ask you a question about
6 this communication internal to the journal, I want
7 to ask if you remember in the UNT so-called ad hoc
8 panel report --

9 A Uh-huh.

10 Q -- a kind of very graphic description of
11 Mr. Walls being forced into Timothy Jackson's car
12 and coerced to basically publish something he didn't
13 want to publish?

14 A I do remember something about a car,
15 yeah.

16 Q Okay. But you don't remember that in
17 detail?

18 A No, I don't.

19 Q Right? Its connection to censorship?

20 A I do not, no.

21 Q Okay. So if we look at the top of
22 page -- sorry, UNT2758, do you see how that e-mail
23 is signed by Levi Walls?

24 A Uh-huh.

25 Q And if we look at the very bottom of the

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 219

1 previous page, it states from February 13th,
2 10:54 a.m.?

3 A Very bottom --

4 Q Of the -- of the page -02757?

5 A Two seven --

6 Q I'm sorry to jump around but the e-mail
7 spills over --

8 A Uh-huh.

9 Q -- from one page to the next --

10 A Okay.

11 Q -- in an inconvenient way.

12 A Yeah. Could you say what you just said
13 again?

14 Q So the e-mail is from Levi Walls; right?

15 A Uh-huh.

16 Q It's dated February 13th?

17 A 10:54 a.m.

18 Q Yes.

19 A Uh-huh.

20 Q It says, "To me" -- meaning Timothy
21 Jackson -- "and Benjamin Graf."

22 Did I read that right?

23 A Correct.

24 Q He writes, "Dear Dr. Jackson," he copies
25 some other people who are working on the journal?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 220

1 A Uh-huh.

2 Q But not Dr. Slottow?

3 A Uh-huh.

4 Q He says, "Dr. Graf and I were wondering
5 what your thoughts were concerning the submission
6 from Clark Beaudoin" --

7 A Beaudoin.

8 Q Beaudoin.

9 A Uh-huh.

10 Q Thank you.

11 -- "and Lett. As you may have seen,
12 these responses are, at least implicitly,
13 anti-Schenkerian. Despite disagreeing with much of
14 what they have to say, Dr. Graf and I think it is
15 important to publish these responses."

16 Did I read that right?

17 A Yes.

18 Q So it sounds like he was in favor of
19 publishing responses that were favorable to you;
20 right?

21 A Correct.

22 Q Do you know if those three responses were
23 in fact published?

24 A They -- so Beaudoin, Lett, and Clark,
25 yes. We're talking about Suzannah Clark, Harvard

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 221

1 University; Richard Beaudoin, Dartmouth College --

2 Q Uh-huh.

3 A -- Stephen Lett, who is no longer, I
4 think, in the field.

5 Q Is that consistent with someone who is
6 being pressured not to publish these pro-Ewell
7 papers?

8 A Again, I would take issue with the
9 conflation of this timeline.

10 Q Uh-huh.

11 A Because we started with Levi Walls in
12 July --

13 Q Uh-huh.

14 A -- after the publication of Volume 12,
15 and you've gone back to November.

16 Q Correct.

17 A Now we are in February; right?

18 So I think that it's quite reasonable to
19 presume that once all of the journal responses were
20 collated into an issue, it seems that Levi Walls
21 read it and then began to take issue with some of
22 the points that were being raised there and so
23 essentially -- well, as I said, changing his
24 opinion.

25 Which, over the course of eight months,

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 222

1 is not so unreasonable, I think.

2 Q Isn't the simpler explanation that at the
3 moment it appeared there was a massive social media
4 attack on the journal and they, quote, changed their
5 mind?

6 MR. PAINTER: Asks for speculation.

7 BY MR. ALLEN:

8 Q That's all right. You can answer.

9 THE WITNESS: Do I have to?

10 MR. PAINTER: You should give some
11 answer, whatever answer you think
12 is the --

13 THE WITNESS: Okay.

14 A Can you repeat the question, please?

15 BY MR. ALLEN:

16 Q Isn't the simplest explanation that they
17 were attacked on social media and by the SMT and by
18 everyone claiming the journal was racist and they,
19 quote, changed their mind then?

20 A No.

21 Q You don't find that plausible at all, do
22 you?

23 A I wouldn't say plausible at all. I would
24 say that's not the actual issue, though.

25 Q Somehow they are saying at the time the

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 223

1 journal articles are being gathered and published,
2 they -- Levi Walls disagrees with your work?

3 A Uh-huh.

4 Q They want to solicit these papers, they
5 want to solicit others.

6 And then all of a sudden, they change
7 their mind after the journal comes out?

8 A I think it's probably a little bit of
9 both, don't you?

10 Q Well, I'm not the one testifying.

11 A That's true. I apologize.

12 I think it's entirely reasonable,
13 however, to think that two things can be true at
14 once.

15 Q Do you know that after the attack on the
16 journal, Levi Walls openly expressed his fear for
17 his career?

18 A I do not know that.

19 Q Just one last example here. If you could
20 skip to UNT02697?

21 A Six, nine -- six, nine, seven. I'm in
22 the sevens...

23 Q -2697?

24 A -2697, yes.

25 Q And this is an e-mail from Benjamin Graf

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 224

1 to JSS authors and advisory board; do you see that?

2 A Yeah, start- --

3 Q Oh, sorry, I should say, the bottom of
4 the page?

5 A Uh-huh. Yeah.

6 Q March 14th, 2020?

7 A Uh-huh.

8 Q And I'm just going to represent to you
9 this was the time when the special volume -- the
10 special symposium and the entire Volume 12 went to
11 the press.

12 A Okay.

13 Q So it was finished in its editorial phase
14 and it was just going into production.

15 A Uh-huh.

16 Q Just going to skip down past the numeral
17 three on that bottom of that page; do you see that?

18 A Uh-huh.

19 Q "Levi Walls has done excellent work on
20 this volume and the journal will be in good hands as
21 he takes over sole editorship of the JSS. In my
22 view, the additional content that we collected this
23 winter following Ewell's SMT plenary makes a great
24 addition to an already remarkable publication."

25 Did I read that correctly?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 225

1 A Yes.

2 Q Is that consistent with Benjamin Graf
3 telling you in his Facebook message to you that, I
4 don't know, he was complicit in some sort of
5 silence?

6 A Huh.

7 Q Or he didn't want to do it or --

8 A No.

9 Q Okay. He says, "Cheers getting this to
10 press."

11 Right?

12 A Uh-huh. Yes.

13 Q Then on March 20, there's another message
14 from Ben Graf to Barry Wiener, maybe pronounced it
15 Wiener.

16 You would know?

17 A I don't know.

18 Q You don't know.

19 Was Barry Wiener critical of you or in
20 favor of you?

21 A Critical.

22 Q Ben Graf writes to a critical respondent,
23 I suppose we'll call him, "Thank you, Barry. I
24 should note that I enjoyed reading your response to
25 Ewell."

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 226

1 Did I read that correctly?

2 A Yes.

3 Q Do you have any reason to believe that
4 Benjamin Graf would lie about that?

5 A No.

6 MR. ALLEN: I think I have one last
7 document to present to you and I think we
8 will probably be able to wrap this up.

9 I can't promise that Benjamin Walton
10 won't have some questions for you.

11 THE WITNESS: Sure.

12 MR. ALLEN: But let me move on.

13 I'm going to -- we're done talking
14 about Mr. Walls and Mr. Graf.

15 I want to ask you some additional
16 questions about your colleague, Ellen
17 Bakulina.

18 THE WITNESS: Bakulina.

19 MR. ALLEN: So if I could mark this
20 for the record. We are introducing here
21 Exhibit Number 9. This is marked in the
22 exhibit folder 06 UNT2559.

23 (Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 9,
24 Document Presented to Ad Hoc Review
25 Panel, was marked for

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 227

1 identification.)

2 MR. ALLEN: Sorry.

3 BY MR. ALLEN:

4 Q Now, before you look at this, again, I'm
5 not suggesting that you know anything about this
6 document.

7 It's because some things are represented
8 about you in the document that I want to ask you
9 questions about it.

10 A Sure.

11 Q This is also a document that was
12 presented to the so-called ad hoc journal review
13 panel that UNT convened to investigate solely
14 Timothy Jackson for the supposed whatever they
15 thought the journal of Schenkerian studies did
16 wrong, I suppose.

17 And you can see that in the header; do
18 you see that in the first message?

19 A "Talk with UNT ad hoc journal review
20 panel"?

21 Q Yes?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And that's Ellen Bakulina --

24 A Uh-huh.

25 Q -- and her e-mail at UNT?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 228

1 A Correct.

2 Q And I understand she's no longer there.

3 So if you skip down a few pages, you'll
4 see that there's an attachment that says, "Dear Dean
5 Richmond"?

6 A Uh-huh. "Dear Dr. Richmond," yeah.

7 Q Uh-huh. And you'll see -- I just want
8 to -- you see how there's a subheading A, close
9 paren?

10 A Uh-huh.

11 Q I guess it's the third paragraph.

12 A Uh-huh.

13 Q She gives a little bit of a history of
14 her participation in the journal?

15 A Uh-huh.

16 Q And then she also says -- I'm just going
17 to begin with the sentence, "The e-mails were an
18 exchange."

19 Do you see that?

20 A One second.

21 Q Third sentence?

22 A Yes. Go.

23 Q "The e-mails were an exchange of opinions
24 on Ewell's keynote talk. They led to another string
25 of e-mails which were directly related to the call

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 229

1 for responses. The string was initiated by Levi
2 Walls whose initial e-mail, November 25th, 2019, was
3 sent to several theory faculty, included some that
4 are not on the JSS editorial board. The second
5 e-mail exchange led to the formulation of the call.
6 I discussed the formulation with the editors but
7 didn't make any substantive suggestions."

8 A You said "editors" when it said "others,"
9 but aside from that, yes.

10 Q I apologize for misspeaking and thanks
11 for catching that.

12 A Uh-huh.

13 Q Now, did Ellen Bakulina ever talk to you
14 about her role on the journal?

15 A No.

16 Q So you don't know whether she's
17 representing this accurately or not?

18 A Correct.

19 Q If you could skip down to UNT02560.

20 And this is one of the infelicities of
21 electronic documents.

22 A Uh-huh.

23 Q But do you see there's a page number
24 smack in the middle of the page number three?

25 A Uh-huh.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 230

1 Q I want you to look at the paragraph right
2 before that?

3 A "In retrospect"?

4 Q Correct.

5 A Uh-huh.

6 Q This is Ellen Bakulina in a letter to her
7 dean, who is Dean Richmond.

8 "In retrospect, I regret that I did not
9 contact Ewell to ask if he would like to write a
10 response to the responses or to simply inform him
11 about what is happening in JSS. A lack of such
12 timely contact with Ewell on part -- on the part of
13 JSS editorship is part of what is currently being
14 condemned on social media. In fact, I did think of
15 contacting him in December 2019, partly because he
16 is a long-time friend and a former mentor of mine."

17 Did I read that correctly?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Now, you've testified today that she did
20 contact you in around that timeframe; right?

21 A Yes. I would say it was probably
22 February 2020.

23 Q But at that time she expressed no concern
24 that you hadn't been personally invited?

25 A The only thing that was stated in her

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 231

1 e-mail was -- it was maybe one sentence and it
2 was -- the title of the -- the subject title was
3 "JSS responses."

4 Q Uh-huh.

5 A And it was of the order, "Dear Phil, Do
6 you have any questions about" --

7 Q Uh-huh.

8 A -- "these JSS responses," because the
9 call for papers had gone out.

10 So I was aware at that point that --

11 Q Uh-huh.

12 A -- that this was being put together.

13 And as I said earlier, I responded, No, I
14 have no questions.

15 Q And she doesn't say anything about that
16 here, does she?

17 A She does not.

18 Q Do you know of any reason that she lacked
19 the power to invite you personally?

20 A I presume I -- I presume that she was not
21 part of the backbone of the Journal of Schenkerian
22 Studies.

23 As it -- as it was shown in the ad hoc
24 report, Steven Slottow and Timothy Jackson were the
25 editorial advisors.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 232

1 Q Uh-huh.

2 A And to be honest, I didn't know if Ellen
3 Bakulina, who is a Russianist --

4 Q Uh-huh.

5 A -- like me, whether she was involved with
6 journal at all in any capacity, whatsoever. And --

7 Q If she --

8 A If I may.

9 Q Please.

10 A And therefore it didn't even strike me
11 to -- to wait for an invitation from Ellen Bakulina
12 because I just didn't think she was involved with
13 the production of this journal.

14 Q Right. And does this message to the dean
15 of her school of music clarify that she was indeed
16 involved in the production of the journal, at least
17 in the fall and winter of 2020?

18 A Well, what you've read confirms that she
19 regrets that she did not contact me.

20 It doesn't really clarify what role she
21 played, if any, in the journal's structure. And she
22 may have had a role, maybe on the editorial board.
23 I don't know.

24 Q And also, I believe I misspoke. I meant
25 fall and winter of 2019, not fall and winter of

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 233

1 2020. That was when --

2 A Uh-huh. Nineteen going into '20.

3 Q Yes.

4 Do you -- this is true that -- what she
5 says here that you were long-time friends and she
6 was a former mentee of yours; right?

7 A Yeah, I -- I mentioned that she -- that I
8 was on her dissertation committee --

9 Q Uh-huh.

10 A -- when she was at the graduate center,
11 yes.

12 Q Are you still in regular contact with
13 her?

14 A Regular, no. I haven't heard from her in
15 a while.

16 Q Okay.

17 A If I could try to say when, it would
18 be -- it actually was some -- let's call it, five,
19 six months ago because she's working on a project --
20 this is irrespective of the Journal of Schenkerian
21 Studies or the University of North Texas -- Thomas
22 Christensen, Carmel Raz, and one other person are
23 putting together this big, thick, multi-volume work
24 on music theory.

25 And Ellen is kind of spearheading some of

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 234

1 the Russian music theory aspects. And she and
2 Thomas Christensen, a music theorist -- music
3 theorist at the University of Chicago, invited me to
4 write a section on -- on the music theorist Modest
5 Rezvoi, who was a Russian music theorist who in
6 198 -- sorry, 1830 translated some very significant
7 terms.

8 Q And can I just interrupt you to say that
9 she's involved in a very significant work of
10 scholarship?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Do you know her to be an especially
13 fragile individual?

14 A I -- I can say with a little bit more
15 certainty than -- because you asked the same
16 questions of Ben Graf, I think.

17 She -- could you clarify "fragile
18 individual," in what respect?

19 Q Well, do you know that she is afraid to
20 speak her mind?

21 A Yeah. Yeah. Occasionally, yes.

22 Q And do you think she's particularly
23 cowardly?

24 A I wouldn't use the word "cowardly," but I
25 also wouldn't say "forceful" and -- and "ambitious"

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 235

1 and I wouldn't say the opposite of "cowardly"
2 either.

3 Q Do you know of any reason she couldn't
4 have spoken up and said you needed to be invited,
5 for instance?

6 A I think probably because she was
7 pre-tenure, if I'm not mistaken. I think she was at
8 this time.

9 Q Do you know that she was threatened with
10 a denial of tenure if she spoke up in some way?

11 A No, I do not know that.

12 Q And in fact, she did feel at least
13 comfortable enough to reach out to you?

14 A Correct.

15 Q But she didn't mention any of these three
16 concerns at the time that you said were hallmarks of
17 the improper publication of Volume 12?

18 And let me list them: The anonymous
19 publication, right; the failure to invite you in
20 person; and I believe you said the failure to have
21 peer review of the article; right?

22 A Uh-huh. Yeah.

23 I didn't use the word "hallmarks," but
24 yes, you remembered the three points, correct.

25 Q She didn't mention any of those things?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 236

1 A Correct. She did not.

2 Q Do you know of any reason she couldn't
3 have spoken up if she really did object to that at
4 the time?

5 A Other than the fact that she's pre-tenure
6 and pre-tenure people are in fact, as you know,
7 vulnerable and often hesitant to speak up.

8 Q She wasn't hesitant to speak up when she
9 condemned Timothy Jackson, was she?

10 A I don't know how she condemned --
11 condemned Timothy Jackson.

12 Q Do you know that the faculty circulated a
13 petition condemning -- condemning Timothy Jackson
14 after the publication in July 25, 2020?

15 A I think I have a recollection of that.
16 I -- I can't specifically say.

17 Q Her lack of tenure didn't prevent her
18 from signing onto that, did it?

19 A And 900 people signed an anti-racist
20 letter to SMT, most of whom I would presume were
21 un-tenured also, so...

22 Q So she had at least enough civil courage
23 to do that; right?

24 A Civil courage?

25 Yeah, let's just say that she signed the

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 237

1 letter, yes, she did.

2 Q So just to close this off, the things
3 that she's representing here to her dean and by
4 extension, the so-called ad hoc panel investigating
5 the journal and Timothy Jackson, you didn't discuss
6 this with her?

7 A No.

8 Q And you haven't discussed it since?

9 A No.

10 Q Okay.

11 MR. ALLEN: Can we go off the
12 record?

13 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off
14 the record. The time is 3:28.

15 (Whereupon, there was a recess taken
16 from 3:28 p.m. to 3:32 p.m.)

17 (Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 10,
18 E-mail Exchange Between Philip Ewell
19 and Rachel Gain, was marked for
20 identification.)

21 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going back
22 on the record. The time is 3:32.

23 BY MR. ALLEN:

24 Q Professor Ewell, I'm marking for the
25 purposes of the record Exhibit Number 10.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 238

1 This is an e-mail exchange with what
2 appears to be you and a defendant named Rachel Gain.
3 It is Bates-stamped UNT1146.

4 Do you recognize this document?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Do you remember sending this document?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Do you know who Rachel Gain is?

9 A She was a graduate student at UNT. I
10 believe she's at Yale University now.

11 Q Your alma mater?

12 A My alma mater. That's right. Not --

13 Q Have you had --

14 A -- far from here.

15 Q Have you had any further contact with
16 her?

17 A I gave a talk at Yale -- two things: The
18 same talk in Florida, the virtual talk I gave --

19 Q Uh-huh.

20 A -- was also attended, probably virtually,
21 by Rachel Gain. And when I e-mailed -- I think I
22 may have e-mailed from my Hunter e-mail both Levi
23 Walls and Rachel Gain and -- essentially saying hi.

24 You know, I had had this e-mail -- this
25 Facebook exchange with Levi Walls -- Walls or Wall?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 239

1 Q Walls.

2 A With an "S"?

3 Q Yeah.

4 A Okay. With -- yeah.

5 Q To interrupt you, just for the record,
6 you were -- when you said, "this," you were
7 referring to the exhibit --

8 A Exhibit 7.

9 Q Thank you.

10 A Uh-huh. And this note from -- in -- in
11 Exhibit 10 from Rachel Gain. And I had sent an
12 e-mail essentially saying the same thing that I said
13 to Levi Walls, which is, I look forward to your
14 talks. I'm giving a talk. I hope to see you there.

15 Q Uh-huh.

16 A And then I gave an in-person talk at Yale
17 University fall of '22.

18 Q Uh-huh.

19 A It was whenever Rachel Gain moved. She
20 was there at the talk.

21 Q Uh-huh.

22 A And along with maybe a hundred other
23 people and -- and I saw her. It was the first time
24 I've ever physically met Rachel Gain.

25 Q Did she discuss with you any of the

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 240

1 circumstances of the publication of Volume 12 of the
2 JSS?

3 A No.

4 Q Did she discuss with you any of her
5 criticisms of Timothy Jackson?

6 A No.

7 Q And this e-mail seems to have been
8 initiated by her; correct?

9 A Correct.

10 Q And she e-mails you on July 27th, 2020,
11 at 7:30 in the evening, an apology from the UNT
12 graduate students; right?

13 A Correct.

14 Q Do you know why she was claiming to speak
15 on behalf of the UNT graduate students?

16 A I thought at the time -- I think that she
17 had some type of student counsel leaders position
18 where she -- I don't know if it's elected or
19 something, but, you know, there was a student body,
20 graduate student alliance. You know, graduate
21 students have organizations among them.

22 And I think that she was contacting me
23 kind of on -- maybe it's even said here that -- the
24 graduate student --

25 Yeah, so that's my -- my recollection

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 241

1 is -- the MHTE graduate student body -- oh, and she
2 was the vice president. There it is.

3 So I'm looking at the third page.

4 Q Yes.

5 A I don't want to do your job for you
6 but --

7 Q No, go ahead.

8 A But yeah, on the third page the actual
9 apology that they were writing was from the
10 president -- it seems there are two presidents and
11 then a vice president, Rachel Gain, of the MHTE
12 graduate student body.

13 I do not know what MHTE stands for.

14 Q Just for the record, do you see where it
15 says "Division of Music History, Theory, and
16 Ethnomusicology" in the top of that letter?

17 A In the -- I see actually in the top of
18 the email on the very first page that that's listed,
19 so that must be MHTE.

20 Q Correct.

21 A Uh-huh.

22 Q All right. So in this letter of apology
23 that I suppose these MHTE graduate students sent to
24 you, do they discuss anything about the three
25 objections that you had to the Journal of

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 242

1 Schenkerian Studies in Volume 12?

2 Again, the anonymous publication, the
3 failure to peer review, and the failure to reach out
4 to you individually?

5 A Well, I -- I don't recall, but the actual
6 apology is on the third page of your exhibit.

7 And I don't know if they -- may I read
8 this and --

9 Q Please.

10 A -- and then we can actually just put --
11 put some teeth onto that question.

12 Okay. It seems they did not mention any
13 of those three specific things.

14 Q They are just engaging with what we might
15 call viewpoints; correct?

16 A Yeah, I would say opinions but yeah,
17 sure, viewpoints.

18 Q Fine. And in fact, they say in her cover
19 e-mail to you: "I would also like to offer my
20 personal apologies for everything that has happened.
21 There are no excuses for the views published,
22 platform [sic], and encouraged by our department's
23 publication and faculty members. I am sincerely
24 sorry."

25 Right?

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 243

1 A Correct.

2 Q And she also -- jumping back to the
3 letter -- says something about structural racism.

4 Do you see that?

5 A Can you give me a line number? First
6 paragraph, second paragraph?

7 Q First paragraph, seven lines down?

8 A Uh-huh. Okay. Hold on.

9 Yes, okay. Got it.

10 Q Did you ever lecture Rachel Gain on the
11 meaning or not of racism?

12 A No, I don't lecture anyone on the meaning
13 of racism. Never have, never will.

14 Q So you didn't bring up the lack of
15 meaning of that term that you've kind of testified
16 to today with her?

17 A No.

18 Q Okay.

19 MR. ALLEN: Okay. Ben, I have no
20 further questions for this witness.

21 MR. WALTON: All right. Can we go
22 off the record and take a brief break?

23 MR. ALLEN: Yes. And I've been
24 instructed to change chairs.

25 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 244

1 the record. The time is 3:39.

2 (Whereupon, there was a recess taken
3 from 3:39 p.m. to 3:47 p.m.)

4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going back
5 on the record. The time is 3:47.

6 MR. WALTON: Dr. Ewell, we are back
7 after a brief break and it's now my turn
8 to ask a few questions.

9 I'll try -- try to keep these as --
10 as targeted as possible.

11

12 CROSS-EXAMINATION

13

14 BY MR. WALTON:

15 Q Just, first off, it's nice to meet you
16 remotely. Sorry I couldn't be there in person.

17 But to clarify for the record, you and I
18 have never spoken before right now; correct?

19 A That is correct.

20 Q Okay. Could you -- I -- I know there's
21 been a lot of talk back and forth throughout the
22 day.

23 I was wondering if you could give me
24 something as a handle to just as -- as clearly and
25 succinctly as you could, summarize what you see as

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 245

1 the relationship, if any, between Heinrich
2 Schenker's ideas and music theory as it has
3 developed in the United States?

4 A Yeah. So the second part of what you
5 just -- what you just ended with is extremely
6 important, "music theory as it's been developed in
7 the United States."

8 Because Mr. Allen had asked about
9 Heinrich Schenker and then almost immediately
10 followed it up with the white racial frame.

11 And I essentially pushed back on that in
12 the sense that the direct connection between
13 Heinrich Schenker and music theory's white racial
14 frame, well, there is none. That's 1935 and now
15 it's 2024. So one must make connections; right?

16 And the reason -- I often will say not
17 just Heinrich Schenker, but the legacy of Heinrich
18 Schenker. That's really the main point of -- of my
19 crit- -- my criticism of Heinrich Schenker.

20 It's really not so much about the person,
21 it's very much about the legacy that he left via
22 these emigres to -- first to the east coast and
23 Chicago -- there was one person there. That might
24 have been Oswald Jonas. And -- and then what
25 happened in the ensuing 90 years after Heinrich

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 246

1 Schenker died.

2 So if -- if one studies race scholarship
3 as virtually no music theorists do, it need be said,
4 right, it's not a common thing, then it actually
5 becomes pretty clear to see how and why a figure
6 like Heinrich Schenker could become so extremely
7 popular, especially in the 1930s and '40s where
8 racial segregation and the Jim Crow racism were just
9 on fire in our country.

10 So when the -- the -- the writings, the
11 pseudoscientific writings of Schenker, the
12 anti-black racist writings, the anti-Asian racist
13 writings, the anti-Islam writings -- he -- he mocked
14 the Arabic language in one very interesting,
15 poignant footnote, for example -- then we can begin
16 to see how in the 1930s in the United States and the
17 1940s, well, that just fit perfectly -- it fit
18 perfectly with the American mind; right? It wasn't
19 just music theory, it -- it was America.

20 We were living in the 1930s and '40s
21 through a virulently racist -- and now I will just
22 say that word, a word I generally don't say -- a
23 virulently racist period of our country, thousands
24 upon thousands of African Americans slaughtered in
25 lynchings and mass race occurs -- sorry, mass --

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 247

1 mass massacres, race massacres; right.

2 So when I start -- you're asking about
3 the connections of Heinrich Schenker and how I'm
4 putting these things together now.

5 Well, one must really tell the story in
6 great detail going through the years and one cannot
7 distill and say, How does Heinrich Schenker, the
8 person, connect to today's music theory's white
9 racial frame?

10 The short answer to that question is,
11 well, in almost no way, actually, if you are going
12 to ask me that specifically.

13 But that's not how I answered a question
14 that was very similar put to me by Mr. Allen because
15 I have to relate this history of how these things
16 actually happened.

17 It's very common among race scholars to
18 do that and I think I did it pretty effectively in
19 music theory.

20 I don't know if I answered that
21 question -- did I answer that question, Mr. Walton?

22 Q I -- I think so. And, you know, my
23 question was not coming from a request to clarify a
24 specific thing from earlier today.

25 It was just more of a broad question for

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 248

1 those of us who aren't either sociologists, race
2 scholars, or music theory scholars, how would you
3 describe your -- your thesis, as it were, in a
4 nutshell?

5 A Uh-huh. Yeah, well, the thesis is that
6 the -- the historic white supremacy -- and
7 patriarchy, by the way, it's something I always
8 hasten to add -- of the United States of America
9 have manifested themselves in the field of music
10 theory. Obviously they've manifested themselves
11 from top to bottom in any academic field, in any
12 walk of life.

13 And that's something that most people
14 would concede, they would acknowledge that -- that
15 historically the country does have a white
16 supremacist and patriarchal past; right? That's not
17 an open question.

18 The question for me as an American
19 citizen and as a Ph.D. holder in music theory is --
20 who hap -- who happens to be a black person, is how
21 those things have come together to create a
22 situation in which, as I put in that article that we
23 talked about earlier, out of about 1200 people,
24 there were two associate professors who were black.
25 I was one of them. Now I'm a full professor.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 249

1 That's an unacceptable percentage. It's
2 an unacceptable percentage to have two black
3 associate professors, out of -- associate out of
4 1200 -- 200 people, maybe, let's say, that would be
5 one percent; right?

6 Black Americans are roughly 14 percent of
7 the country. I'd like to see 14 percent associate
8 professors in my field. That would be a fair
9 system.

10 But apparently there are people who don't
11 want that.

12 We all know that what we are living
13 through in the United States of America, we will get
14 through it and we will get through it together.
15 Together. We will fight through these racial
16 problems, our racial past.

17 If I can go down one small rabbit hole, I
18 spent some time in Norway this summer and I gave a
19 talk -- a couple of talks: One at the University of
20 Oslo, the other at the Music Academy in Oslo.

21 And you all probably know, I'm sure
22 you've all been to Europe, you probably know that
23 Europeans are really good at pointing the fingers at
24 Americans when it comes to racism; right.

25 And I tell my colleagues in Norway and I

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 250

1 tell anyone else who will listen, you know what, I'm
2 a black American. We're fine. Leave me and leave
3 us out of this.

4 Look at yourselves in the mirror, my
5 Norwegian colleagues. You look at yourselves in the
6 mirror and you ask yourselves about your own views
7 about black people, for example, or about your
8 Somali immigrants, about your own anti-blackness;
9 right.

10 So I'm going to climb back out of my
11 rabbit hole and simply say that these -- these
12 anti-black elements, these anti-woman elements,
13 these anti-Jewish elements, these anti-Islam
14 elements, anti-Asian elements are in fact part of
15 contemporary music theory.

16 In part, why? Because they are part of
17 our American society. It's not all about our
18 country. Our country has many beautiful, great
19 things about it and I do, in fact, highlight those
20 things.

21 I don't get credit for that and I'm fine
22 with that. People don't want to talk about Phil
23 Ewell actually praising the United States, which I
24 do. I'm okay with that.

25 And if people want to criticize me

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 251

1 because -- and they call me a racist and a sexist
2 and an anti-Semite because of something I -- fine.
3 You know, I'm -- I'm a big boy. I can handle the
4 pressure.

5 But I do -- I do think it's extremely
6 important to make the connections to show how some
7 of the structural anti-black, structural white
8 supremacist elements, and structural patriarchal
9 elements in music theory have manifested themselves
10 in the United States.

11 And let me just end by that very same
12 statistic. You are asking, how?

13 I'm like, well, I've explained how in
14 lots of writings. One result would be two black
15 associate professors. The numbers don't lie. The
16 numbers do not lie.

17 There are 94 percent white people who
18 have power in music theory. Tenure. That's the
19 result of the racial segregationism, the
20 anti-blackness, etc., of -- of Heinrich Schenker's
21 American legacy, among other problems that we have
22 in music theory. Heinrich Schenker was obviously
23 not alone.

24 Q Do you -- just to clarify, do you believe
25 that white males today should not have a say in

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 252

1 music theory's development?

2 A Not at all. That's -- that -- that --
3 I -- I was about to say, that's a silly question. I
4 don't mean to say that. I'm sorry, Mr. Walton. I
5 don't want to say that.

6 But no, of course not. I believe that
7 white men should have absolutely a seat at the table
8 right here, whether we are in a -- in a table in --
9 in New Haven.

10 But for my purposes, a table of
11 discussions of music theory moving forward. I'm
12 honored and humbled that hundreds -- hundreds of
13 white men have reached out to me from high school
14 students who are literally 14 years old who are
15 Zooming with me for an interview or -- or just
16 asking for some -- some questions, you know, to my
17 colleague John Snyder, who finished my book a few
18 weeks ago and just wrote me -- he's at the
19 University of Houston as a professor of musicology.

20 And he's certainly in his seventies, a
21 white man. He just said, Thank you for your
22 thought-provoking book. It was very, well,
23 thoughtful.

24 To which I said, Thank you for reading
25 it, John. I look forward to seeing you at the next

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 253

1 conference; right.

2 I welcome white men with open arms and
3 I'm really honored and humbled that so many have
4 taken me up on these calls.

5 Q I'm -- I'm going to jump around just a
6 little bit and these questions will appear
7 disjointed just because I'm trying to save time.

8 Do you -- you were asked at some point
9 during the day about the idea of censorship.

10 Do you have any personal reason to
11 believe that UNT censored any material that was
12 presented for publication in any of its academic
13 journals?

14 A I have no reason to believe that
15 happened, no.

16 Q Okay. Moving to Levi Walls, do you have
17 any personal knowledge as to why he appeared to
18 change his opinions regarding your presentation?

19 A Personal knowledge, no.

20 Q And did you ever talk with Dr. Benjamin
21 Graf about any pressures he may or may not have been
22 feeling in his position?

23 A No.

24 Q And did you ever talk with Dr. Graf about
25 why he said or wrote any of the specific things that

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 254

1 **you've -- you've looked at earlier today?**

2 A No.

3 MR. WALTON: All right. Well, I

4 hope that was less than 15 minutes.

5 I'll pass the witness.

6 Thank you for your time, Dr. Ewell.

7 THE WITNESS: My pleasure. Thank

8 you.

9

10 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

11

12 BY MR. ALLEN:

13 Q Let me just ask two brief questions.

14 Do you consider Timothy Jackson to be a
15 white man?

16 A I've never met Timothy Jackson and I've
17 only seen a profile picture in The New York Times
18 because Michael Powell published something. And he
19 certainly looked like he presented as white.

20 Q Did you embrace Timothy Jackson's
21 viewpoints because he expressed criticism of you?

22 A I don't understand that question.

23 Q Let me strike it.

24 You just testified in response to

25 Attorney Walton's questions that you embraced white

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 255

1 men who had contacted you, something to that effect.

2 Did I misrepresent that testimony?

3 A Slightly. I've -- I've welcomed white
4 men who contact me to have discussions, adult
5 conversations, about race and music theory,
6 patriarchy, etc.

7 Q Have you welcomed Timothy Jackson's
8 criticism of your work?

9 A No.

10 Q In fact, you've said it's dehumanizing;
11 right?

12 A I'm thinking about the chapter that I
13 responded to Timothy Jackson. I do not believe I
14 used the word "dehumanizing" in that chapter. And
15 that's the most rigorous unpacking of his particular
16 response, so no.

17 Q You did say it was dehumanizing to the
18 journalist of the Denton Record Chronicle, however;
19 correct?

20 A Yeah.

21 Q So isn't it true that you only welcome
22 white people who agree with you?

23 A That's not true, no.

24 MR. ALLEN: I'll pass the witness.

25 MR. WALTON: We'll reserve.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 256

1

2

CROSS-EXAMINATION

3

4 BY MR. PAINTER:

5

Q I think we are going to clarify one issue
6 on -- and I guess I would ask the question as your
7 counsel -- about the peer review.

8

There was some confusion with your
9 plenary talk.

10

A Uh-huh.

11

Q And the plenary talk you were invited to
12 give and I believe there was testimony about how
13 that process worked.

14

But then you gave the plenary talk and
15 then they republished your plenary talk.

16

Did they republish that word for word?

17

A Yes, more or less.

18

There might have -- you know, when you
19 give a plenary, maybe there's something on a slide
20 that doesn't make it into the text, maybe there's a
21 comma that you want to add.

22

So I can't say verbatim exactly what I --
23 what I spoke. But, you know, 98, 99 percent
24 verbatim and more or less no change in the content
25 of the talk itself.

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 257

1 Q Did they do that from a tape recording
2 or -- or from the -- a piece of paper that you --
3 because you read the talk that you give them a copy
4 of the paper?

5 A A piece of paper. And, in fact, Marianne
6 Wheeldon, the editor at the journal at the time, had
7 asked us to reproduce the -- the PDF word text of
8 those talks.

9 So it -- it wasn't up to them. We
10 basically went -- I had put in a comma if I needed
11 one and I essentially handed over the PDF of what I
12 had read in front of the -- in front of the plenary.

13 And I should also say that sometimes
14 people extemporize a little bit in addition to
15 speaking from script.

16 My particular talk, since I knew it would
17 be, well, let's say, controversial -- speaking about
18 whiteness as a black person is almost always
19 controversial in a white supremacist system; right?

20 I literally had scripted every word that
21 I read that day. So the plenary talk was in fact
22 the PDF that I had sent for publication.

23 Q And you sent it after you gave the talk?

24 A Correct. Yeah.

25 Q And is this common with plenary talks

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 258

1 that when -- if they are published, they are
2 published word for word what was said, with that
3 exception that some people give some extemporaneous
4 comments, but that it's a set talk and then it's
5 published.

6 And have you ever heard of any type of
7 peer review process ever be used really for
8 republication of plenary talks?

9 A No. Plenary talks are not peer reviewed
10 generally in -- in -- in music academia.

11 MR. PAINTER: Okay. No further
12 questions.

13 MR. ALLEN: I have no further
14 questions.

15 MR. WALTON: Nothing further here
16 either.

17 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. This is
18 the end on the video deposition of Philip
19 Ewell. The time is 4:04.

20 MR. WALTON: Dr. Ewell, thank you
21 for your time.

22 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
23 (Whereupon, there was a discussion
24 off the record.)

25 MR. WALTON: Cliff, we will take an

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 259

1 electronic only copy of the transcript.
2 No need to order a paper copy but I would
3 like a PDF.

4 COURT REPORTER: Okay. Thank you.
5 (Thereupon, the deposition was
6 concluded at 4:04 p.m. EDT.)

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 260

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2 I hereby certify that I am a Notary Public,
3 in and for the State of Connecticut, duly
4 commissioned and qualified to administer oaths.

5 I further certify that the deponent named in
6 the foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn, and
7 thereupon testified as appears in the foregoing
8 deposition; that said deposition was taken by me
9 stenographically in the presence of counsel and
10 reduced to typewriting under my direction, and the
11 foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the
12 testimony.

13 I further certify that I am neither of
14 counsel nor attorney to any of the parties to said
15 suit, nor am I an employee of any party to said
16 suit, nor of any counsel in said suit, nor am I
17 interested in the outcome of said cause.

18 Witness my hand and seal as Notary Public
19 this 3rd day of October, 2024.

20



21

22

Clifford Edwards

23 Connecticut Notary Public No. SNPC.0129714

24 My commission expires: 9/30/2026

25

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 261

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

J U R A T

I have read the foregoing 260 pages and hereby
acknowledge the same to be a true and correct record
of the testimony.

PHILIP ADRIAN EWELL

Subscribed and sworn to

_____.

Before me this _____ day of _____,
2024.

Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 262

1 DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET

2

3 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____

4 _____

5 Reason for change: _____

6 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____

7 _____

8 Reason for change: _____

9 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____

10 _____

11 Reason for change: _____

12 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____

13 _____

14 Reason for change: _____

15 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____

16 _____

17 Reason for change: _____

18 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____

19 _____

20 Reason for change: _____

21

22

23 SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

24 NAME: PHILIP ADRIAN EWELL

25

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.
Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Page 263

1 DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET

2 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____

3 _____

4 Reason for change: _____

5 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____

6 _____

7 Reason for change: _____

8 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____

9 _____

10 Reason for change: _____

11 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____

12 _____

13 Reason for change: _____

14 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____

15 _____

16 Reason for change: _____

17 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____

18 _____

19 Reason for change: _____

20

21

22

23 SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

24 NAME: PHILIP ADRIAN EWELL

25

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: -002645..14th

	EwellP 9	192:12	17 139:2
Exhibits	4:13	05 134:17	140:2
	226:21,23	06 226:22	158:13
EwellP 1	EwellP 10	07 159:8	162:8,22
3:11 6:21,	4:15	08 206:9	182:23
24 7:1	237:17,25	09 117:25	183:11,22
12:10	239:11		195:19
EwellP 2			221:14
3:13			224:10
117:6,18,	-	1	235:17
22	-002645	1 6:21,24	240:1
EwellP 3	180:17	7:1 12:10	242:1
3:14	-02757 219:4	136:24	12- 44:13
130:8,18	-235 207:2	10 237:17,	45:13
EwellP 4	-2657 202:1	25 239:11	120 65:18
3:18	-2663 185:11	100 56:19	1200 28:20,
158:24	-2697	210:9	24 248:23
159:4	223:23,24	10:09 5:7	249:4
EwellP 5	-2705 208:8	10:29 26:7,9	12:10
3:20	-berg 116:3	10:31 26:9,	114:23,25
164:10,17	-berger	11	12:12 114:25
EwellP 6 4:6	116:3	10:54 219:2,	115:2
178:24	-stood 54:10	17	12:27 130:5,
179:9,10		11 131:6	7
180:6	0	11209 6:11	13 144:1
199:16,17		11:18 75:9,	217:12
207:23	00 72:24	16,18	13th 219:1,
EwellP 7	011UNT2645	11:31 75:18,	16
4:10	180:9	20	14 249:6,7
191:20,24	012 164:13	12 104:20	252:14
239:8	023 130:20	105:12	14,000 44:13
EwellP 8	0234 206:9	107:22	45:13
4:12	03UNT0441	137:1,10,	14th 62:20
205:18,20			224:6
207:3			

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: 2021..900

204:20	25 192:1	3:32	
206:17	236:14	237:16,22	6
209:8,10	250-year	3:39 244:1,	6 178:24
224:6	92:15	3	179:9,10
230:22	25th 147:22	3:47 244:3,	180:6
232:17	192:9	5	199:17
233:1	229:2		207:23
236:14			
240:10	26 117:19	4	6,000 99:17
	118:1		101:17
2021 21:1		4 158:24	
66:18	2657 200:19	159:4	61 119:20
111:15	27 204:20	4,000 44:19	
194:22	27th 206:17	46:12,13	7
2022	209:8	4.4 131:5	7 191:20,24
139:17,19	240:10	40 126:23	239:8
2023 139:12	2:41 200:4,	400 125:7	77th 6:10
2024 5:6	6	40s 246:7,	7:30 240:11
86:9	2:48 200:6,	20	
169:14	8		8
245:15	2nd 203:22	4:04 258:19	
20th 74:4		259:6	8 205:18,20
87:11	3	4:21-cv-00033	207:3
21 139:17		5:5	80 66:8
219 38:25	3 130:8,18		85 78:4
	30 96:21	5	107:1
22 29:14,17	126:22,23		
30:20	129:22	5 164:10,17	9
31:17	31st 138:5	500 56:10	
183:17	181:24	125:2	9 226:21,23
239:17		55 58:20,24	90 107:1,5,
24 22:18	324 6:10	62:12 65:8	18 245:25
125:11	330 96:21	57 99:25	900 158:9
24-page	3:16 217:6	100:3	210:8
125:15	3:28	101:16,22	236:19
240 59:7	237:14,16	102:9	

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: 91..ad

91	17:16	abstract	249:20	achieve
	18:1,6,20	168:8		20:11
	19:5		accept 49:5	
		ac- 140:5	50:8,16,24	acknowledge
92	18:5,14	academia	65:23 66:8	62:18
94	251:17	144:9	80:16	96:18 98:5
98	256:23	187:9	acceptable	248:14
99	256:23	258:10	129:6,9,13	acknowledgment
		academic	accepted	54:20
9:14	203:23	23:3 35:6	15:20 53:1	acoustics
		36:15	65:18 66:3	94:14
	A	49:15		
		52:10,16,	access 71:4	act 168:14,
A&m	78:3	19 93:6	128:9	16 169:10,
		110:12	160:20	22
a.m.	5:7	117:3	account	actions
	26:9 75:18	126:19	11:25 30:1	76:17
	203:23	127:8,24	140:15	
	219:2,17	128:6,21	189:25	active 90:6,
abbreviation		129:7,9,	accurate	8,19
	181:9	17,22	8:17 10:7	actual 34:4
abide	9:12	140:5	101:18	93:15
		145:7	112:21	141:1
ability		151:8,15,	118:3	157:12
	10:19	18 152:13	172:20	174:15
ableist		153:16	201:19,20,	210:3
	36:21	155:22	22	222:24
absolute		160:4,25		241:8
	91:3	161:4,8,19	accurately	242:5
absolutely		162:13	112:20	
	9:24 60:16	177:21	168:19	ad 147:6,
	68:10	209:18,20	197:22	16,20
	113:2	248:11	229:17	148:3,8
	129:19	253:12	accused	153:1,6,10
	170:24		76:22	179:12,24
	199:21	academician		181:14
	210:9	16:5	accusing	188:6,10
	252:7	Academy	135:2,8,21	191:3
				204:16

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: Adam..Allen

211:20	208:16	affiliations	213:10
218:7		21:10	ahead 88:6
226:24	admission		93:20
227:12,19	76:1,6	afraid	94:13
231:23	admitted	234:19	157:1
237:4	72:12	African	166:4,8
Adam 48:1	74:8,9	246:24	211:12
add 52:6	ADRIAN 6:9	afterward	241:7
73:22	adult 255:4	146:11	air 19:1
100:9	advance 68:6	aggressive	68:24 70:9
248:8	113:25	30:22	aired 145:22
256:21	advancing	agree 38:23	album 44:2
added 150:14	62:14 88:4	39:25 65:3	45:4
adding 89:22	198:5	78:23	Alegant
addition	advantage	79:23 97:4	51:4,8
224:24	56:12	104:3	Alejandro
257:14	advice 10:8	108:19	5:8
additional	12:18 13:5	110:15,22	align 86:13
224:22	15:5 174:8	160:24	alive 65:20
226:15	advisors	203:25	73:25
address	188:11,17	211:10	allege
33:25 36:8	194:10	217:8	141:23
39:1,2,9	195:23	255:22	allegedly
43:9 52:15	231:25	agreed 33:17	150:11,15
144:6,12	advisory	44:12	Allen 5:15,
146:8	193:19	71:24	16 6:14
165:12	224:1	82:24	7:5,13
addressed	affect 10:25	154:8	12:8,13
146:17	66:12	207:11	25:25
148:4	170:22	209:3,5	26:2,12
addresses	affected	agreeing	39:19,21
146:9	80:13	204:5	40:5,10,
addressing	affiliate	agreement	14,17,20
203:14	21:19	133:4	41:5 43:4,
		213:12,15	
		agrees 113:1	

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: alliance..anonymous

6 46:6	192:4,10,	ambitious	248:18
53:9,12	17 194:1	234:25	250:2,17
62:3,7,9	199:19,21,	ambivalent	251:21
63:12	23 200:1,9	208:19	Americans
64:15	205:17,23	amendment	55:5,11,21
65:20	206:6,7,12	61:13,15,	64:20
69:16 70:4	211:1,3,7	23 62:11,	70:24
75:3,7,14,	222:7,15	20 63:4,5,	71:1,4,18,
21 94:1	226:6,12,	6,16	21,22
111:10,13,	19 227:2,3	150:24	72:1,8,20
17,23	237:11,23	151:13,20	246:24
112:2,5,8,	243:19,23	152:4	249:6,24
11,15,18	245:8	amendments	analysis
113:2,5,8	247:14	62:25	208:20
114:20	254:12	America	213:4
115:3	255:24	69:2,4,9,	analysis.'
117:9,16,	258:13	11 90:11	207:9
21 118:2	alliance	96:8	analytical
130:3,16	240:20	106:24	168:10
151:16,24	allowed	107:21	angle
152:2,9,11	144:15	171:3	168:11,22
155:12,16,	170:5	246:19	announced
22 156:1,	allowing	248:8	138:3,12
4,10,13	153:16	249:13	201:8
159:3,15,	alma	American	announcement
19,22	238:11,12	23:6,12	183:18
164:8,23	aloud 131:9	54:21	185:1,6
166:18,23	alphabet	55:12	announcements
167:1,6,	89:18	68:11	182:16
12,15,20	alteration	76:11,13	annual 39:10
170:14	181:5	78:4 80:1,	anonymous
175:6	Am- 171:2	3 85:8	46:20
178:1,22	Amadeus	86:8 88:12	124:22
179:5,16	92:13	97:19 98:4	141:20,25
180:3,4,7,		168:23	
11,12		246:18	
185:9			
191:19,23			

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: anonymously..argue

146:25	23 106:14	68:20	238:2
148:11,16,	107:6,12	Apartment	applied
24 149:9	114:10	6:10	78:17
177:3	250:8	apologia	applies
235:18	251:20	209:24	102:19
242:2	anti-islam	apologies	applying
anonymously	246:13	242:20	16:1
141:21	250:13	apologize	approached
answering	anti-jewish	26:13	122:4,5
8:5 11:11	250:13	91:22	approval
26:16	anti-music	94:10	133:2,7,8
73:17	85:12	113:24	approve
75:24	anti-racism	180:8	109:18
answers	85:15	198:13	149:16,19,
205:25	86:14,19	223:11	25
anti-asian	158:6,16	229:10	approved
246:12	anti-racist	apology	177:11
250:14	85:9,13,19	204:21	Approvingly
anti-black	86:8,11,17	240:11	109:11
60:23 80:6	236:19	241:9,22	approximately
83:6,22	anti-	242:6	28:18
84:1,3,18,	schenkerian	apparently	29:11
19 102:14,	220:13	209:13	46:10
18 103:10,	anti-semite	249:10	99:12,17
21 246:12	251:2	appeared	April 139:12
250:12	anti-woman	8:17 139:2	Arabic
251:7	250:12	148:1	95:15,16
anti-blackness	anti-womanness	222:3	246:14
80:7,9,18	107:7,12	253:17	Arcangelo
81:1,7,11	anticipated	appears	92:17
82:6	137:8	35:13	Archive
83:12,15	antisemitic	125:4	99:15
84:4,7	212:22	202:10	argue 70:21
86:20	anymore	203:11	
102:16		216:17	
103:7,15,			

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: argued..attend

88:1	43:2,5	235:21	assistant
102:13,15	46:1 47:3	248:22	19:24
114:9,11	50:13,17	articles	20:19
149:3	51:23	44:1 78:16	associate
argued 85:7	52:25	119:8,12	20:19,24
103:10	53:25	120:4,23	77:12
104:6,8	54:4,6	121:22	123:23
108:1	55:7 68:6	122:2,10	142:11
110:7	77:20	123:12	248:24
146:21	79:9,17	124:2,16	249:3,7
argues 86:16	80:14	126:4,10,	251:15
arguing	81:20 85:7	18 127:8,	Association
83:19	88:1,2	24 128:3	23:9
110:14,15	108:2,23	134:18,24,	assume 11:16
114:4	109:5	25 139:1	87:1,5
argument	111:8,14	176:25	111:22
61:24	113:24	223:1	121:16
62:12	114:11	artists	150:18
68:15	119:15,20	71:23	181:19
70:19 72:6	120:24	Arts 16:11	assuming
arguments	124:12	as- 112:13	149:24
86:19	125:4,10	asks 39:6	152:14
arms 253:2	126:15,17,	222:6	atrocious
array 55:4,	24 127:14	aspect 68:10	65:3
10,20 57:5	128:12,21	161:13	attachment
64:19	130:9,21,	176:18	228:4
arriving	24 131:5	aspects	attack
96:23	133:17	149:14	210:20
article	134:15,19	234:1	211:12
27:19,21	136:23,24	assets 55:5,	222:4
28:2 32:23	157:12	11,21	223:15
33:1,15	164:14,18	64:20	attacked
34:2,11	165:2,10,	assign	209:17,20,
36:5 37:2,	13,21,25	180:21	25 222:17
10 42:17	171:6	attend	
	172:16		
	177:23		
	178:2		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: attended..Bakulina

215:16	author 36:4		207:22
attended	37:1,10	B	211:3,6
215:20	112:17,20,	Bach 92:12	214:10
238:20	22 114:3	95:19	221:15
	128:22	97:22	237:21
attention	129:21	104:16	243:2
102:23	146:25		244:4,6,21
167:21	148:13,17	back 17:24	245:11
179:17		18:7,13	250:10
181:11,21	author's	19:8 20:6	back-and-forth
201:2	109:8	26:10	48:22
211:15	110:11	28:8,21	
216:1	148:24	35:20	backbone
218:3	authorities	47:12,13	231:21
attorney	162:24	49:4 53:1,	background
5:16,19,	authors 44:9	13,15	15:13
22,25 6:3,	116:11	56:2,22	54:25 87:2
6 9:8	139:9	59:16 67:8	bad 103:4
13:11	163:25	69:17	badge 115:21
14:16	224:1	73:23	Bak- 200:22
254:25	authorship	75:19	
attorneys	149:9	77:18	Bakulina
13:21	avatar	81:11 89:8	77:5,15
180:21	192:21	93:7 97:5	116:8,11
181:5		107:17	121:12,13,
attributed	aware 109:2	113:7	14,21
213:22	137:9,12,	115:1	125:22
audibly 9:18	16 138:2,	122:13,19	142:8
August	13 149:20	130:14	143:4,8
164:21	153:5	136:8	144:19
165:5	157:19,24	140:7	154:10
172:3	164:5	158:1	176:3,5
	177:5	174:15	200:22
Austria	178:15	176:15	202:5
87:15,19	188:24	199:16	203:7
Austrian	231:10	200:7	226:17,18
87:9	awful 63:6	201:17	227:23
		205:13	

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: ballpark..bit

229:13	238:3	begins	benefit
230:6		171:12	150:24
232:3,11	bathroom	207:5	benefited
ballpark	75:13	208:16	59:2,8
32:1	199:20	212:19	198:3
Barry	batting	behalf	benefits
225:14,19,	123:11	240:15	84:21
23	battle 51:10	behind-the-	198:7
baseball	80:21 81:4	scenes 51:10	Benjamin
105:21	Beach 174:1,	123:5	187:22,25
based 30:9	4,5,6,14	belaboring	188:24
32:23	Beaudoin	48:6	190:5,14
43:7,10	177:13	belief 84:12	192:24
64:24 86:6	220:6,7,8,	133:11	196:12,24
107:19	24 221:1	beliefs	198:3
141:2,3	beautiful	107:3,4	202:15
basic 15:13	62:19	131:19	203:22
105:23	250:18	132:11,18,	204:4
133:5	Beethoven	19 210:12,	219:21
160:14	92:12	15	223:25
basically	95:20	believed	225:2
18:25 52:9	104:16	163:12,15	226:4,9
125:7	105:11	belong 23:3	253:20
136:11	began 20:9	Ben 5:21	Betsy 25:19
175:10	43:22,25	180:4,11	26:23 27:4
180:1	51:1	188:1,3,	35:8
181:1	221:21	13,14,20,	big 190:20
218:12	begin 88:14	21 189:7	207:23
257:10	228:17	190:13,16	233:23
basing	246:15	191:5	251:3
147:12	beginning	196:1	bigger 67:22
Bates 180:19	5:2 24:23	199:2	Bingham
192:13	57:1 89:22	225:14,22	62:21
208:8	193:10,16	234:16	bit 15:9
Bates-stamped	208:11	243:19	16:3 27:19

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: black..bubble

43:14	blackness	book 81:3	243:22
47:11	73:3,8	85:14	244:7
73:18	173:7,24	86:13,15,	Breeding
77:25	174:11,12,	16 106:15	164:21
126:21	14	127:2	165:4,16
127:12	blacks 73:21	137:21	168:1
173:12		139:8,11	171:5
187:23	blame 59:3,	140:5	
223:8	7,11	142:5	Brent 72:25
228:13	Blanchard	149:5,11	73:24
234:14	66:19	252:17,22	Brian 51:3,8
253:6	blind 36:21	books 54:16	briefly
257:14	block 111:25	78:8	15:14 16:8
black 60:5,8	112:6,14	129:24	19:19
65:19	131:12,22	border 69:12	80:24
66:17		born 87:10	91:25 98:8
67:23,24	blog 194:10	bottom 171:9	114:21
70:24	blowing	180:13	118:11
71:1,4,18,	172:3	182:2	122:13
21,22	195:15	202:2,18,	206:2
72:1,7,20	blown 189:15	19 208:1,	bring 7:23
73:1,5,12	board 53:3,	11 211:24	81:11
74:22	5,16	218:25	176:22,24
76:5,11,13	145:16	219:3	243:14
80:2 82:3,	193:19	224:3,17	brings 21:2
15 83:10,	224:1	248:11	broad 247:25
14 84:20,	229:4		
25 85:1,5	232:22	boy 251:3	broadly
101:14	Bob 182:6	Brahms 97:22	107:22
102:22	185:25	brains 67:21	Brooklyn
103:9		break 75:1,	6:10
174:20	body 95:6	3,6,8,23	brought 7:6
192:15,16	240:19	112:3	144:7
248:20,24	241:1,12	113:3	bubble
249:2,6	bogus 114:14	126:14	195:25
250:2,7	Bones 66:19	199:20	
251:14			
257:18			

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: build..centuries

build 78:23	233:18	career	15:19
	242:15	15:13,15	16:2,4
burning	251:1	19:20	18:4
35:19		21:13	
Butterfly	call- 138:18	77:22 80:2	cello 15:24
44:3 45:6,	called 36:18	198:5	18:2,3,8
23	45:6,22	223:17	23:9
	47:4 54:16		192:22
<hr/>	94:17 98:7	Cari 6:2	ensor
c	99:14	Carl 73:9	217:25
	104:22	Carmel	ensor-
call 22:17	124:21	233:22	161:2
23:21	133:19		
36:20,23	147:6	case 5:5	censored
44:24 51:8		47:9 51:9	149:4
69:9 92:6,	calls 138:18	52:3 58:15	253:11
15,16	253:4	66:13	
93:14	campaigned	83:12 87:1	ensorship
97:23	82:12	106:8,10	149:16
102:18	Canada 69:10	152:3	160:24
107:8		180:24	161:3
125:9	cancel	206:16	218:19
126:24	195:11		253:9
138:3,11,	199:11	catching	ensure
12 144:24		229:11	149:7
162:11	cancelled		
167:21	195:10	category	center 21:20
176:21	199:9	178:25	22:8,11,24
181:11	candidates	caught	25:22
182:24	217:15	196:19	87:15
183:5,18		caused 96:16	123:16
186:8,22	canonic	208:19	233:10
187:11	97:23		
203:1,10,	capacity	causing	Central 20:3
18 204:5	232:6	211:17	centrality
225:23	caption	cease 150:4	108:9
228:25	182:22	151:9	113:16
229:5		161:5	centuries
231:9	car 218:11,	cellist	56:2,9
	14		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: century..claims

95:18	197:17	Chicago	circumstances
170:12	223:6	234:3	240:1
century 67:8	243:24	245:23	cisgender
73:23 74:4	253:18	children	85:2
87:10,11	256:24	81:15	cite 95:13
92:16	changed	chords 92:7	127:25
97:9,10	50:24 53:4	96:2	128:3,10,
100:22	80:15	Chris 116:12	20
108:12	209:15,16	120:19	cited 103:18
113:19	210:13,15,	123:12	citizen 61:2
certainty	17,19	177:13	168:17
234:15	222:4,19	Christensen	248:19
certificate	changing	233:22	citizens
16:19,21,	221:23	234:2	29:9
24 17:4	channel	Christmas	citizenship
chair 14:22	30:14	19:2	168:14
51:2 80:22	chapter	Christopher	City 15:21
82:10,11	139:24	121:21	20:7
120:8	255:12,14	123:17	21:20,21
chaired	chapters	125:22	22:14,16
123:17	127:2	Chronicle	23:1 65:21
chairs	characteristic	164:14	civil 62:22
243:24	s 96:3	255:18	236:22,24
challenged	characterize	CIEE 17:22	claim 162:1
164:19	212:12	Cincinnati	212:25
165:2	charming	116:13	claimed
challenging	192:22	Cindy 165:16	193:18
173:7	check 101:10	171:5	claiming
chance 80:9	108:15	circle	81:5
109:7	Cheers 225:9	167:11	206:23
144:6	Cherokee	circles 93:6	222:18
159:23	58:23	circulated	240:14
change 49:8	cherry	236:12	claims
51:14,16	101:22		164:19

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Index: clarification..commented

165:3	70:22	218:12	21:25
217:23	classroom	coffee 196:3	22:21,22
clarification	17:3 55:15	collapse	collegiality
11:16	Clause 60:20	18:17	175:23
39:14 46:5	clean 113:24	collated	colloquies
52:22,24	clear 9:20,	221:20	144:8
63:11	21 11:13,	colleague	187:8
109:20	18 13:6	25:21	colloquy
110:1	41:1 94:4	200:21	145:14
111:6	110:17	201:5	148:18
137:12	114:1	226:16	162:12
154:24	124:12	252:17	175:22
155:6	140:4	colleagues	colonial
156:24	177:15	28:11	93:4
173:21	202:17	123:13	colonializatio
177:25	246:5	175:23	n 93:5
180:8	cleared 94:9	202:9	color 100:23
clarified	client 32:17	249:25	169:1
50:2	76:10,17	250:5	comfortable
clarify	115:7	collected	235:13
35:12 43:2	211:22	224:22	comma 202:9
50:8 70:25	Cliff 5:10	collection	256:21
109:7	258:25	179:11,23	257:10
135:25	climb 250:10	College	comment
185:5	clipped	14:23	150:22
232:15,20	31:16	15:21	163:1
234:17	close 123:13	20:3,7,12	181:18
244:17	228:8	22:4,11,	186:23,24
247:23	237:2	12,13	187:1
251:24	co-authoring	39:18	197:1,6,11
256:5	86:7	40:19	commentary
Clark 220:6,	coast 245:22	41:24,25	198:23
24,25	coerced	80:21 83:4	commented
classical		84:8 221:1	121:4
16:14		colleges	
67:15			

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Index: commenting..conflation

150:23	174:13	108:4	157:21
commenting	complaining	113:11	158:6
144:11	174:3,9	Compromise	163:4
comments	complaint	60:2,22	210:5
37:17,20	176:24	concede	236:13
46:22,25	complaints	248:14	conduct
103:17	42:7	conceived	38:12
171:21,23	completely	106:12	160:14
174:1	44:18	conceiving	conducting
258:4	45:13,17	92:22	156:10
committed	162:19	concept	conf- 27:13
76:17	complicit	54:17 56:8	confer 40:1,
87:17	225:4	68:22	3,6,7
committee	complicity	conceptions	conference
25:14,18	198:13,19	69:21	27:14
26:23	199:3,6	100:22	115:18,24
27:1,15	compliment	concepts	116:21
28:16 51:3	129:23	56:5	117:1
53:17,19	comport	107:22	119:25
123:17,20	201:13	concern	124:19
233:8	comportment	230:23	127:3
common 97:24	199:11	concerns	190:17
129:11	composer	235:16	253:1
213:22	66:17,20	concluded	conferences
246:4	composers	259:6	24:25
247:17	92:10,16	condemnation	115:20
257:25	97:23,24	149:6,12	confirm
communication	98:2	condemned	113:23
39:7 218:6	104:20	230:14	130:23
communications	105:13	236:9,10,	confirms
214:10	107:24	11	232:18
215:9	composition	condemning	conflating
comparable	98:15	153:16	175:18
124:20	106:7,8		conflation
complain			

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Index: confront..contributed

221:9	28:17	consult	240:22
confront	58:10 69:9	40:12	contemporaneou
81:14	202:23	155:10	s 200:12
confusion	consistent	consulted	contemporary
256:8	108:5	14:5,12	70:17,21
Congressman	113:12	consulting	250:15
63:1	158:1,19	12:9	content
connect	160:25	contact	128:21
65:12	161:8,20,	141:24	198:11,22
247:8	25 162:16	142:4,6	206:24
connected	163:5	143:19	217:21
65:7,8	171:24	145:3,7	224:22
173:23,25	204:7	146:20	256:24
connection	213:9	189:2	contents
102:17	221:5	214:21	119:3,15
103:6	225:2	230:9,12,	147:15
213:3	consistently	20 232:19	context 48:4
218:19	108:8	233:12	136:1
245:12	113:15	238:15	continent
connections	consortium	255:4	69:11
133:15	22:17	contact@	continue
245:15	constituting	philipewell.	13:23
247:3	39:7	com. 12:2	17:21
251:6	Constitution	contacted	26:20
conservative	59:1,14	30:11,17	48:15 76:3
108:6	60:21,23	44:7	81:13
113:13	61:10,14,	140:21	89:25
conservatories	15,17	142:6,17	continuous
73:6	62:6,19	143:19,21	180:23
conservatory	63:18,23	144:18	contribute
15:25	64:2,13,	148:25	88:8
16:18	17,25 65:9	255:1	90:10,17
18:14	66:11 67:7	contacting	contributed
considered	Constitutional	141:19	90:2,6
	58:19	199:5	
		230:15	

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: control..correct

control	113:24	83:2,10	148:5,6
41:23,25	159:10	84:2,9,19	150:25
206:23	164:15	85:23 86:5	153:1,4
217:21	167:4	87:12,19,	160:9,11,
	181:23	20 89:12,	12,15,16,
controversial	189:8	23 94:8	18,23
257:17,19	257:3	99:6,10	165:18
controversy	259:1,2	100:16,25	168:3
126:2,5		101:19	171:19
	cor- 23:19	102:14	172:18
convened	Corelli	103:12	174:18,24
58:19	92:17	108:23	175:2,13
147:7		112:8,22	177:7
179:13,25	corner	114:7,19	178:16
211:20	192:14	115:8,9	180:18
227:13	corpus 57:20	117:4	182:4,21
convention	correct 11:3	118:22	183:1
58:19	21:3 22:1,	119:1,5,19	184:9,12,
conversation	5 24:3,6,7	121:19	24 185:20
9:13,14	29:21,24	122:16	186:15
14:25 15:1	32:25	123:13	192:7,23
62:17	33:3,4	124:13,17	194:14,25
167:16	34:9	125:12,14,	196:5
191:17	37:18,21,	17,18	197:15
201:4	24 38:3	127:19	206:17
	39:3,10	130:25	212:10,15
conversations	41:24 42:5	131:3,10,	214:24
35:1 255:5	43:18	11,17	216:11,24
conversely	47:6,7	132:6,7,	219:23
42:21	52:1,13,16	13,14	220:21
converted	53:4,14	134:6	221:16
82:2	54:2 60:6,	138:21	228:1
	9 62:24	139:22	229:18
copies 35:19	64:7 78:24	140:6	230:4
219:24	79:17,20	142:21,23	235:14,24
copy 7:6	81:25	144:19,25	236:1
8:11 28:5	82:7,13,	146:23	240:8,9,13
35:14	23,25	147:1	241:20

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: corrected..CUNY

242:15	13:2 14:1	court 5:9,13	criticism
243:1	40:1,3,12	6:25 7:7	126:9
244:18,19	155:11	8:25 9:11	140:10
255:19	159:11	26:1 46:4	145:21,25
257:24	164:16	63:10 91:2	146:2,8
corrected	240:17	109:7	245:19
70:14	256:7	117:6,8,	254:21
		14,17	255:8
Correction	count- 66:12	157:7	
64:10	Counterpoint	177:24	criticisms
69:25	98:16	191:21	212:23
		192:3	240:5
correctly	countries	211:6	criticize
113:21	16:16	259:4	173:23
119:18	country		250:25
132:20	56:23	cover 179:18	
161:15	58:3,21	242:18	criticized
165:6	65:13		142:2
169:6	66:12	COVID 117:1	174:20
171:18	73:13	cowardly	
173:11	96:20	234:23,24	CROSS-
181:25	168:15	235:1	EXAMINATION
188:7	170:17		244:12
198:15	171:2	create 107:1	256:2
201:11	246:9,23	248:21	Crow 246:8
207:14	248:15	created	crucial 68:1
208:23	249:7	56:1,10	
212:12	250:18	68:24	Cubero
224:25		90:11	202:15
226:1	country's	107:19	cultural
230:17	54:22		110:19
	168:13	creating	
correspondence		9:17	culture
38:1 98:19	counts 117:4	credit	108:6,10,
Council	couple 77:4	250:21	11 113:13,
17:23	249:19	crit- 245:19	17,18
			114:5
counsel 5:12	courage	critical	CUNY 21:23
10:9	197:9	225:19,21,	22:2 25:22
12:18,22	236:22,24	22	28:12

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: curricula..Dekalb

123:16	day 27:4	230:15	defining
curricula	29:22	decided 17:5	79:4
55:14	117:16	51:22	definition
cut 63:14	176:8	207:7	93:8
CV 50:17	244:22	decision	156:14
	253:9	49:9,10	defunct
	257:21	81:18,19	11:25
D	day. ' 168:18	124:24	degree
D-R-A-B-K-I-N	days 31:1	decisions	15:16,19
111:3	deal 162:25	80:15	16:15,17
damage	dealing	128:23	degrees 23:2
173:9,18	97:22	decline	105:20
Daniel 26:24	dealt 44:5	108:10	dehumanization
Danny 25:20	112:13	113:17	172:25
Dartmouth	123:5	deemed 56:7	174:23
221:1	dean 228:4	deeply	175:5
date 5:6	230:7	54:21,22	176:14
24:20,21	232:14	108:5	dehumanize
25:2	237:3	113:12	155:15,17
129:24	Dear 202:8	209:14	156:4,15,
138:12	212:14	default	18 177:18
206:17	216:19	56:13	186:22
dated 164:21	217:8	defendant	dehumanized
165:5	219:24	187:22	154:20,23
181:23	228:4,6	200:22	155:4,9
192:1,9	231:5	238:2	156:8,21
206:17	decades	defendants	157:8
208:12	54:18	5:22,25	187:4,6
216:15	170:12	define	dehumanizing
219:16	December	76:19,20,	156:25
dating 67:8	19:2	24 93:9	157:5,15,
David 53:7	138:5,13	135:6	18 193:7
174:1,5,6,	181:24	defined 89:8	255:10,14,
14	200:24	170:20	17
	203:22	Dekalb 17:24	

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: deleted..directly

18:1 19:14	5:20	98:8	156:25
deleted	111:14	104:10	difficult
140:15	deponents	118:11	80:20
189:25	40:11	120:3	108:7
delivered	depos- 11:22	248:3	113:14
122:7	deposition	describing	187:2
demeaned	10:10	48:15	196:1,11, 22
153:24	deposed 6:12	description	difficulties
154:22	9:5	118:4	26:14
156:20	deposition	218:10	
demeaning	5:3 6:18	descriptions	digged
156:25	7:2,7,16	48:11	205:6,7
157:17	8:15,25	detail	diligent
174:25	9:7 10:11	218:17	38:6,12
denial	11:23	247:6	dinner 196:7
235:10	14:16	developed	direct 7:11
denied 76:6	15:3,11	79:2 95:12	12:3
82:12	39:23	245:3,6	169:14
denies 71:4	40:24	developing	179:17
Denton	107:16	78:16	181:21
164:13	111:19	development	184:1,5
255:18	155:19	252:1	189:12
deny 83:9	164:12	diaries	201:2
204:22	258:18	98:18	205:5,7
department	259:5	died 73:10	211:15
14:23	depositions	87:25	214:8,12, 15,19
80:22	9:9 41:13	88:10	218:3
82:11	depth 86:24	106:22	245:12
department's	describe	246:1	directions
242:22	15:14	Diego 202:15	23:8 67:18
depends	19:20	difference	directly
128:12,13	36:14	27:20	88:11
deponent	43:20 87:3	127:21	169:22
	91:1,25	154:25	170:22

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: director..documents

228:25	74:3,16	118:8	241:15
director	75:25	143:25	DMA 16:2,6,
186:3	discuss	165:11	9
disagree	14:15	193:14	Doctor 16:11
82:21	39:19	216:9	doctoral
90:19	165:9	258:23	22:25
129:20	204:4	discussions	72:16
184:25	214:4,6	252:11	74:12
185:1	217:15	255:4	doctrines
209:19	237:5	disjointed	58:7
disagreed	239:25	253:7	document
82:20	240:4	Disparaging	7:14,19
disagreeing	241:24	101:14	8:14,22
220:13	discussed	dispute 82:8	12:7 14:7
disagrees	12:22 13:1	disputing	38:23
223:2	14:22	110:8	39:24
disclose	38:24	dissent	111:7
181:14	41:21	105:20	147:24
disclosed	122:11	dissertation	164:9
181:13	127:21	123:17,20	166:11
204:15	130:22,24	233:8	180:5
discovery	132:24	distance	181:5,7
180:22	133:17	198:11	191:25
discriminated	171:25	distill	192:6
73:21	186:12	247:7	206:5
76:10	187:23	distilled	226:7,24
discriminates	229:6	28:7	227:6,8,11
70:23	discusses	distinction	238:4,6
71:1,18	39:8	27:22	documents
72:7	discussing	diverse	6:19
discriminating	9:8 37:22	161:12	12:11,18
71:21	81:20 90:3	162:1,4,8	14:5,11
discrimination	133:18	Division	38:13,15
66:23	discussion		41:7,13,19
	64:25		42:4,12,17
			68:8 98:7,

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Index: dominant..editorship

22,23	draw 88:12	240:7	31:20
99:14	169:14	242:19	65:10,11
100:1	driven 81:1,	e-mailed	editing
101:6,12	6	49:8	198:4
102:5	drugs 10:22	238:21,22	editor 34:15
179:11,23	Dubkin 114:3	e-mails	36:11
180:22		11:24	37:23
181:13	dug 205:6,7	40:16	47:14
200:12	duly 6:11	228:17,23,	48:18
210:13		25 240:10	118:15,19,
211:19	<hr/>	e-r 116:5	22 128:13,
229:21	E		24 129:6
dominant	e-mail 31:25	earlier	188:3
105:19	38:1 143:4	122:12	189:3
dots 65:12	179:22	126:17	190:12
double-	181:23	127:4	198:7
anonymous	182:11,14,	130:22,24	257:6
124:21	17,20	131:10	editorial
126:11	185:19	132:25	53:3,5,15,
double-blind	200:21	133:1	16 128:24
36:18	202:10,19	150:23	145:16
37:12	203:6,17	157:17	178:16,20
doubly-	208:1,2,6,	160:3	188:11
anonymous	11,15,16	231:13	224:13
36:23 37:4	211:24	247:24	229:4
123:1	212:19	248:23	231:25
Drabkin	215:8,10	254:1	232:22
108:14	216:6,14	early 87:11	editors 53:6
110:25	218:22	139:17	142:15
131:13	219:6,14	217:16	145:11
132:25	223:25	earn 16:20	154:16
drafted 51:2	227:25	21:7	185:23
65:9 158:8	229:2,5	easily 25:3	188:8,12
drafting	231:1	east 95:15	229:6,8
63:23	237:18	245:22	editorship
	238:1,22,		224:21
	24 239:12	easy 18:9	

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: EDT..episode

230:13	102:15	67:7 68:7	engaging
EDT 259:6	103:14		242:14
education	133:5	embrace	
57:3 59:5	250:12,13,	254:20	English
67:25 68:2	14 251:8,9	embraced	98:25
69:15 72:2	elevated	254:25	100:23
73:6	55:16	emerged 51:9	enjoy 84:21
educational	105:13	emigre 88:14	85:2
15:15	Elizabeth	emigres	194:6,10
17:23	26:24 27:5	245:22	enjoyed
73:22	Ellen 77:5,	encapsulates	225:24
educations	15 116:8,	21:13	enlightenment
55:19	11 120:7	encouraged	97:8,10
Edwards 5:10	121:11,21	242:22	enormous
effect 218:1	122:4,5	end 8:25	196:18
255:1	123:12,20	12:15	enroll 17:5
effectively	125:22	24:24	ensuing
247:18	142:8	38:16	107:1
effectually	143:4,8	87:18	245:25
143:24	144:18	89:22	enter 167:7
egalitarian	154:10	116:5	entire 30:12
58:13	176:2,5	147:25	31:23 62:6
elaborate	200:22	180:6	104:12
126:21	201:20	212:16	106:4
127:12	202:4,8	251:11	165:10
elaborating	203:7	258:18	210:4,7
79:4	226:16	ended 17:24	212:25
elected	227:23	87:14,16	213:20
240:18	229:13	245:5	224:10
electronic	230:6	ends 213:5	entitled
229:21	232:2,11	engage	25:15 49:1
259:1	233:25	175:25	130:9
elements	Ellen's	engagement	episode
	123:20	171:21	188:22
	email 241:18	199:8,11	
	embedded		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Index: equivalent..executive

equivalent	eugenicist	155:3	98:6
181:2	73:11	159:24	examples
equivocate	Europe 68:25	164:24	71:2 81:17
175:7	69:3,6	168:9,24	excellent
equivocation	108:11	171:14	224:19
10:5,6	113:18	174:2,8	excepting
Ernst 88:19	249:22	180:14	61:18,23
essay 127:2	European	184:1,2	exception
essays 98:19	108:10	185:13	127:10
essentially	113:17	200:10	258:3
9:2 36:7	Europeans	216:21	exchange
54:20	69:6	225:25	17:23
73:11 81:5	249:23	230:9,12	191:25
92:21	evaluate	237:18,24	192:7
118:16	27:16	244:6	198:10
158:15	Eve 19:3	250:23	228:18,23
207:11	evening	254:6	229:5
221:23	217:17	258:19,20	237:18
238:23	240:11	Ewell's	238:1,25
239:12	eventually	159:11	exclude 73:5
245:11	32:24 47:3	164:16	excluded
257:11	53:21,25	201:6	72:21 73:2
establish	79:12,16	207:6,11	74:21
119:23	81:23	213:5	144:11
ethical	82:24	224:23	excludes
160:14	evidence	228:24	72:14,15
ethics	83:17 84:6	exact 24:20,	excuse 11:22
158:20,22	Ewell 5:3,20	21 189:21	38:10,25
160:10	6:9,14 7:3	EXAMINATION	110:14
161:9	48:7 75:22	7:11	188:19
163:6,13,	115:5	254:10	202:9
23 164:3,6	118:3	examine 6:19	excuses
Ethnomusicolog	119:16	7:17,24	242:21
y 241:16	130:11,17	165:8	executive
	152:12	examined 8:5	

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: exhibit..fact

186:3	expect	42:21	explicitly	
exhibit		186:20	59:23	F
6:16,21,24	expectations		67:21 73:7	fabric 81:12
7:1,25 8:6	127:7		74:24	fac- 77:1
12:10	expedient		expressed	Facebook
104:24	175:20		103:23	12:3
105:16,17			108:8	140:14,16
111:19	experience		113:15	171:23
117:6,12,	46:14		223:16	191:25
18,22,24	145:7		230:23	192:7,19
118:6	151:17		254:21	204:21
130:8,18	152:13		expresses	205:3,7,
158:24	155:23		114:9	11,19,21
159:4,8,13	197:7		expressly	209:8,11,
164:10,17	expert 78:11		83:8	24 214:12,
166:19,24	explain		174:20	15 225:3
178:23,24	11:21 47:8		extemporaneous	238:25
179:9,10	54:9 71:20		258:3	facial 90:13
180:6	107:15		extemporize	facing
191:20,24	115:13		257:14	164:20
192:12	145:5		extension	165:3
199:16	155:16		213:1	fact 13:1
205:18,20	157:7		237:4	28:1 34:4
207:3,23	169:18		extensive	41:12
226:21,22,	179:2		167:25	51:22
23 237:17,	182:13		extent 14:25	56:1,6,17,
25 239:7,	194:2		55:2 67:16	20 57:19,
8,11 242:6	explained		183:8	24 60:5
exhibits 9:1	251:13		189:16	67:19
exist 41:7,	explaining		extremely	69:10
20,22	176:14		104:13	73:21
existed	189:13		105:24	74:25 78:5
42:18	explanation		245:5	79:19
204:22	222:2,16		246:6	80:14 90:8
existence	explicit		251:5	96:7
15:2	133:13			128:22,25

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: factor..fine

132:15	235:19, 20	133:21	feelings
137:7	242:3	134:11	210:3
139:25	fair 47:11,	fashion	Felix 88:18
148:17	24 49:20,	175:20	fellow
151:21, 25	21 57:17	fashioned	192:22
182:19	58:13	35:14	felt 154:15
183:23	79:6, 7	fast 49:24	156:20, 21
184:15, 18	84:3 88:5	fault 91:22	193:9, 15
188:7	95:4	favor 217:25	field 75:25
197:16, 23	106:1, 3	220:18	129:10
220:23	116:25	225:20	158:17
230:14	123:14	favorable	170:19, 20
235:12	132:24	220:19	173:18, 19
236:5, 6	133:8	favorite	195:6
242:18	139:21	62:20	221:4
250:14, 19	143:20	Feagin 54:14	248:9, 11
255:10	163:21	78:2, 8, 15	249:8
257:5, 21	169:8	90:12	fight 249:15
factor	211:12	fear 223:16	figure 85:21
151:22	249:8	February	246:5
factum	fairly 75:1	219:1, 16	final 46:10
175:24	fall 17:21	221:17	find 25:2
faculty	18:1, 6, 20	230:22	99:1
21:19	20:8	feedback	101:24
76:23 77:2	107:17	67:14	104:21
188:12, 17,	128:23	feel 148:25	131:5
25 196:19	137:22, 24	153:24	142:18
197:13, 16,	139:17	154:20	187:10
19, 23, 24	174:10	157:10	193:21
229:3	194:21, 22	166:9	222:21
236:12	232:17, 25	235:12	fine 13:16
242:23	239:17	253:22	25:5 41:9
failed 213:6	false 184:24	feeling	66:20 75:8
failure	familiar		86:22
143:18	87:6		159:19
154:11, 17	115:10		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: fingers..framing

198:2	81:24 96:4	204:5	fragile
242:18	160:7	215:14	234:13,17
250:2,21	fooling	216:7	frame 24:9,
251:2	169:3	239:13	18 27:25
fingers	footnote	252:11,25	28:6 33:2
249:23	246:15	forwarded	44:22 47:5
finish 151:6	forced	185:10,18	48:17
170:6	218:11	186:9	54:12,13,
finished	forceful	forwards	20,24
17:8	234:25	98:20	55:4,9
224:13	foreign	found 20:7	64:7,12,19
252:17	16:24	104:13	65:7 67:5
fire 66:19	fork 16:3	147:2	68:16
246:9	form 34:7	188:6	70:16,17,
fired 80:23	43:8 46:10	205:6,10	22 71:18
fit 178:24	146:7	foundation	72:7,22
246:17	168:8	96:7,9,12	77:19,21,
flexible	formal 9:11,	founded	25 78:13,
56:9	13 21:9	65:16	17 79:5,19
Florida	forming	66:16	80:1 88:4,
215:4,12	63:23 64:2	founders	9 90:2,10,
238:18	forms 56:24	65:8	13,18
focus 207:19	formulation	founders'	107:9
focused	229:5,6	63:23	127:15
57:11	forthcoming	founding	130:10
176:16	217:11	62:15	131:2
focusing	forward	66:12 68:8	168:3
47:8	49:24	foundings	169:11,23
folder	67:17	65:13	245:10,14
226:22	158:18	four-year	247:9
folks 73:25	171:8	22:21	frame, '
96:23	202:7	fourth	168:24
follow 41:9	203:1,18	119:15	framed 92:22
			framing
			54:17 65:6
			78:7,11

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: Frank..goal

Frank	111:20	gave	24:4	102:2
115:11,13,	257:12	27:3	82:9	108:9
16 116:3	Fugitive	145:12,22		110:20
118:15,23,	60:20	146:3		113:16
24 120:4,	full	215:4		114:5
18 121:8	20:24	238:17,18	give	8:18
122:1,5	71:14	239:16		10:6,15
123:4	123:25	249:18		15:5 25:12
frankly 48:1	177:23	256:14		26:17
51:20 56:2	178:2	257:23		48:10 56:6
69:7 129:3	248:25	general	31:5	71:14
149:18	fully 62:18	54:10		92:19
171:1	functional	166:3		102:5
free 61:5,	95:22,24	183:17		124:19
16 62:11	96:2,6	205:2		164:25
98:15	Functionalism	generally		179:6
166:9	119:16	16:13		199:14
freedom	fundamental	22:2,6,24		222:10
160:19	104:25	23:21		243:5
162:13	105:1,17	24:25		244:23
Freie 98:15	106:11	34:23 35:1		256:12,19
freq- 95:5	future	36:17		257:3
frequencies	85:16,20	151:15		258:3
93:13 95:6		246:22	giving	
	G	258:10	215:5,12	
frequency		generated	216:6	
93:15,21	Gain 237:19	42:12 69:2	239:14	
94:3,5,17,	238:2,8,	generations	glasses	
25	21,23	68:9	7:20,22	
friend	239:11,19,	genere	Global 5:11	
230:16	24 241:11	126:24	Gmail 11:25	
friends	243:10	German	12:1	
233:5	gallery	89:15,17	go-between	
front 6:22	216:3	98:24 99:4	120:12	
95:25	gathered	100:11,24	goal 51:14,	
	223:1	101:1,4	16 73:12	

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: God..handing

God 137:23	213:10	granted 83:1	106:1
Goldner 66:7	233:10	granting	119:14
	238:9	22:25	139:12,16
Gomez 5:8	240:12,15,	grants 23:1	143:18
good 7:23	20,24		154:23
17:22	241:1,12,	graphic	189:20
67:24	23	218:10	192:21
109:6	graduated	gravitas	199:9
120:2	15:18	129:1	203:9
134:8	19:16	gray 195:25	228:11
137:18	Graf		256:6
173:21	187:22,24,	great 44:19	guesstimate
224:20	25 188:1,	55:4,10,20	102:6
249:23	4,13,14,	56:12,15	guidelines
Google	20,21,24	60:13 63:5	127:5
168:13	189:7	64:19 91:8	guys 174:3,
Gor- 18:25	190:5,13,	104:16,23	9
Gorbachev	14,16	105:3,12	
18:25	191:5	224:23	
	192:24	247:6	H
gosh 33:22	196:12,24	250:18	
grad 189:1	198:3	Greek 94:18	half 58:21,
graduate	202:15	grew 43:16	25 62:13
16:25	203:22	79:9	65:8
21:20	204:4	116:15	Hall 30:12,
22:7,8,9,	217:14	group 66:5	17,18
10,24	219:21	88:21	31:25 32:3
25:22	220:4,14	116:11,17	hallmarks
71:12	223:25	119:8	235:16,23
76:2,7,23	225:2,14,	120:8	hand 117:7
123:16	22 226:4,	190:20	181:4
188:12,15	14 234:16	guarantees	handed 118:4
190:11	253:21,24	62:11	124:25
196:13,14,	grammatical	guess 42:21	257:11
15,17	96:11	61:25	handing
197:13,22	grandchildren	76:19	117:6
206:20	81:16		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: handle..hierarchal

159:10	138:15	head 9:20	88:3 90:1,
164:15	176:16	28:20 44:5	6,9,16
handle	195:20	header	97:5,18
244:24	214:23	227:17	98:3,13
251:3	230:11		101:25
		hear 13:11	104:1,6
handled	happily	135:21	105:13
134:19	51:21	136:2	106:18,22
hands 224:20	happy 20:4	heard 83:8	107:2,20
	49:2 196:3	94:5	114:12
Hans 88:15		137:21	133:12
hap 248:20	hard 35:14	138:16	143:25
	73:16 80:5	140:9	144:2,3
happen 6:17	91:19	183:17	245:1,9,
21:1 56:6	135:24	208:17	13,17,19,
80:8 187:8	163:9	233:14	25 246:6
189:20	169:20	258:6	247:3,7
	170:22		251:20,22
happened		hearing	
14:24	harmonic	189:12	held 21:15,
34:24 35:1	105:18	216:7	16 55:5,
41:18 50:1	119:16		11,21
68:23 74:3	Harmonielehre	hegemony	64:20
80:10,12,	98:14	92:21,24	107:23
19 116:24			
152:23	harmonies	Heidelberg	helpful
170:23	92:7	116:3	112:9
171:1	harpist 66:7	Heidlberger	helps 48:3
189:14		115:11,14,	
190:17	Harvard	16 116:4,5	hesitant
194:20	220:25	118:15,23,	236:7,8
207:17	hasten 248:8	24 121:8	
214:20	hate 30:9,	122:1,6	hesitate
242:20	22 31:24	123:5	187:5
245:25	32:11,14,		hesitated
247:16	20	Heidlberger's	89:6
253:15		120:5	
	Haven 252:9	Heinrich	Hey 44:19
happening	he'll 159:17	86:24	hierarchal
74:14,17		87:2,3,6	104:7

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Index: hierarchical..Hunter

107:11	54:22	231:23	hostile
114:13	248:6	237:4	103:9
132:18	historical	Hold 243:8	housed 98:10
hierarchical	54:25	holder	118:13
104:8,13	88:13	248:19	Houston
132:19	historically	hole 157:4	252:19
hierarchies	54:21	249:17	Hugo 97:15
104:14,23	56:21 58:3	250:11	98:2
106:20	81:12	hometown	human 59:9
131:19	248:15	17:25	100:6,11,
132:11	histories	honest 52:9	14,21
133:10	57:2	59:3	157:9,11
hierarchy	history 56:1	136:10	humans 56:10
105:24	57:16	178:9	humbled
106:19	72:24	191:15	252:12
108:3	73:14,20	232:2	253:3
110:18	107:18	honor 51:13,	hundred
113:10	168:12	22 52:12	28:24
114:3,4,15	169:4	145:20	65:22
133:10,11	228:13	honorable	239:22
208:21	241:15	52:19	hundreds
high 61:16	247:15	honored	56:22
252:13	hit 147:11	252:12	252:12
higher	hoc 147:7,	253:3	Hunter 14:23
107:23	16,21	honoring	20:7,11
highlight	148:3,8	51:25 52:7	22:4,11,
77:24	153:1,7,10	160:5	12,13,20
250:19	179:12,24	hope 81:14	39:17
highly 128:8	181:14	239:14	40:18
hip 57:16	188:6,10	254:4	41:24,25
his- 66:1	191:3	Hopi 58:23	80:21 83:3
historian	204:16	horrific	84:7
87:23	211:20	73:22	215:8,9
historic	218:7		238:22
	226:24		
	227:12,19		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: Huseby..incensed

Huseby 5:10	192:2	3	implying
hyphen 202:8	205:22	Illinois	103:3
hypothetical	227:1	17:25 18:3	important
163:18,20	237:20	19:12,14	28:15
	identified	20:2	51:25 52:7
<hr/>	60:8 99:25	illness	55:19 88:3
I	107:24	10:24	97:13,16
icon 78:4	143:18		98:3
idea 46:15	146:24	illuminate	105:25
49:13	148:23	76:25	169:2
78:17 86:4	identify	imagine	176:12
99:16	41:6,13,17	129:3	220:15
134:21	56:12 60:5	152:21	245:6
143:11	identifying	191:3	251:6
144:13	79:4	198:6,20	impossible
153:14,18,	identities	immediately	89:17
21,22	37:5,6	31:1,12	163:17
156:2	identity	154:8	improper
173:15	37:1,6,8	245:9	141:12,15,
253:9	212:21	immigrants	18 146:14,
ideas 55:25	213:4	89:2 250:8	17 147:3
78:21 79:1	ideological	imminent	148:9
83:18	108:8	108:14	177:20
90:14	113:15	impede 80:2	199:5
102:19	114:4	impeded	235:17
106:16	ideologies	77:21	impugn 41:16
125:2	58:5,6	impetus	in- 213:15
157:6	110:19	116:7	in-person
170:13	ideology	implements	239:16
245:2	64:18	39:7	inaccurate
identification	102:18	implicitly	99:18
7:4 117:20	ignorance	74:25	169:24
130:13	212:20	212:22	incensed
159:2	ignore 69:1,	220:12	173:7
164:22			174:11
179:15			

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: incident..interesting

incident	32:10,19	inform	67:5, 74:7
76:9	indigenous	6 192:10	101:24
incidentally	96:23	230:10	instigated
14:18	individual	information	216:5
84:20	234:13,18	39:2,8	institution
157:19	individual's	150:7,9	22:25
incidents	200:15	152:18,20,	67:20
75:24	individually	24 153:3,4	151:3,8,
inclined	242:4	160:20	21,25
56:14	individuals	informed	161:19
included	84:7	129:17	institutional
109:4	187:21	inherently	21:10
162:2	industry	208:21	169:5
229:3	144:7	209:5	170:3,12
includes	146:21	initial	institutions
61:13	148:25	229:2	21:16
including	149:14	initiated	22:18
68:11	153:15	229:1	66:25
inclusion	176:19	240:8	67:10
148:11	183:14,24	inquiry	170:25
incompetent	infelicities	160:19	instructed
81:6	229:20	162:13	152:15
82:18,22	inferior	inside	217:24
83:19	128:6	105:21	243:24
inconvenient	inferiority	207:17	intellectual's
219:11	73:12	insisted	100:4
incorrect	170:16	131:17	interest
85:11	influence	132:9	11:11
independent	68:9	instance	116:17
23:15	influenced	91:5	120:8
Indian 95:13	68:10	129:10	interested
Indiana 44:8	influences	174:1	21:7 79:1
indication	68:13	235:5	154:9
		instances	175:21
			interesting

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: interfere..Jackson

28:15	252:15	227:13	Iowa 73:10
48:21	interviewed	investigating	irrespective
62:16	165:16	237:4	233:20
67:16	intimate	invitation	issue 26:5
96:19, 25	213:3	146:1	51:1
246:14	introduce	183:9, 19,	136:25
interfere	5:12 6:16	25 184:1,	143:23
10:18	117:5	5, 8, 22	147:8
interject	159:3	185:2	149:15
66:21	164:8	186:14	152:2
internal		232:11	153:15
181:15	introduced		154:14
218:6	115:23	invite	175:21
	118:6	143:12	176:9
international	132:5, 15	145:13, 19	185:24
17:23		149:10	188:3
28:25	introducing	154:11, 18	189:5, 7
29:2, 3, 6,	117:21	231:19	195:24
10	131:15	235:19	217:11, 12
	226:20		221:8, 20,
interpretation	introduction	invited	21 222:24
151:20	44:11, 12,	154:2, 4	256:5
interpreted	14, 17	162:10, 12	
70:12	45:1, 2, 10,	176:10	issues 144:6
interpreting	20 46:3, 8,	230:24	191:2
151:13	16 80:24	234:3	
	127:3	235:4	items 12:17
interrupt		256:11	
12:20 16:8	introductions	inviting	J
88:20	98:19	143:9, 15	
234:8	invent	176:20	Jackson 5:4,
239:5	117:16	178:13	16 32:11,
			17 76:10
interrupting	invented	involved	104:4
94:12	70:8	36:7 67:12	115:7
		125:6	134:20
interruption	investigate	209:14	136:18
26:13	180:1	232:5, 12,	137:6
interview	211:22	16 234:9	142:16

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: Jackson's..journal

153:5	26:24	120:5	180:2
178:12,19	Jewish 87:9	125:4	181:15
179:12,24	89:2	126:19	182:23
180:1	212:20	128:5,13	183:10,21
181:14	213:4	129:7	184:22
188:9		133:19,21,	185:3,7,24
202:11,14,	Jim 246:8	22 134:7,	186:15
16 206:9	job 19:21	16,19,23	188:3
207:2,7	20:2,6,7	135:3,9,	189:3,7
208:3,17	48:8 241:5	17,18,22	190:10,12,
212:11,14	Joe 25:21	136:2,7,	21 191:14
216:15,18	26:22	11,22,25	193:4
217:8,24	28:12 35:8	137:7,11	195:18,24
219:21,24	54:14	140:2,3	196:21
227:14	78:2,8,15	141:13,18	198:4,8
231:24	90:12	142:2	199:6
236:9,11,		143:9,18	200:12
13 237:5	jogged 137:5	146:16	203:15
240:5	Johann 92:12	147:3,8	206:21,24
254:14,16	John 62:21	148:4	207:8,13,
255:13	252:17,25	149:4,17,	17 209:12,
Jackson's	Johnson 18:4	20 150:3,5	17,20,24
136:7		151:9	210:5,20
158:14	joke 95:1,	152:16	211:11
218:11	2,3	154:1,17,	216:20
254:20	Jonas 88:18	21 157:10,	217:21
255:7	245:24	22 158:12	218:6
Jacoby 6:2	Jordan 95:15	160:25	219:25
January	journal	161:8,18,	221:19
18:5,14	33:11,15,	19 162:7,	222:4,18
19:7,8	19 34:8	16,22	223:1,7,16
Jeff 47:14	35:13,14	163:4,24	224:20
48:18 49:7	46:13	171:15,22	227:12,15,
53:7	49:15	173:8,17,	19 228:14
Jenkins	116:9	23,25	229:14
25:20	118:7,8,	174:19	231:21
	12,13	175:11,20,	232:6,13,
		24 178:6	16 233:20

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: journal's..Lamar's

237:5	192:1,9	45:3,23	153:12
241:25	204:20	key 92:5,8 105:8,9	158:4
257:6	206:17		176:11
journal's	209:8		120:7
	221:12	131:19	178:8
	236:14	132:11	183:6,7
	240:10		188:2
journalist		keynote	253:17,19
165:4	jump 211:17	215:25	Knoxville 19:22
166:5	214:25	228:24	
168:1	219:6	kind 18:10, 19 32:20	Kontrapunkt 98:14
172:10	253:5		
173:4	jumping		78:6 91:18
175:8	243:2	137:5	
176:10,13, 22 255:18	June 33:6 178:5	149:5 172:3 175:17	
journals	junior	189:13	
35:5,6	123:21,22	206:25	<hr/> L <hr/>
253:13	jury 47:23	209:14	labeling
JSS 192:25	54:11 91:1	218:10	180:6
193:4	92:11	233:25	labor 69:1
194:10	125:6	240:23	
195:22	justifies	243:15	lack 64:18
202:24		55:22	145:25
203:17	justify	knew 18:7	148:13,16,
217:9		77:4	23 176:18
224:1,21		140:20,22	230:11
229:4	55:4,10,20	191:3,6	236:17
230:11,13	64:19	206:16,20	243:14
231:3,8		257:16	lacked 231:18
240:2	K	knowledge	
judgment	keeper 9:2	14:14 25:8	lacking 197:9
150:2	keeping	91:4 101:5	
152:19	72:8,11	124:6	Lamar 44:15, 25
July 172:3	199:4	126:10	
	Kendrick	129:11	
		44:2,15,25	145:23
178:8			Lamar's 44:2
190:10			

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 language..Leviwalls@myunt.edu.

45:3,23	73:14,17	151:12,22	197:19
language	layperson	152:2,7,10	208:21
17:18,20,	92:2 99:1,	legible	Levi
21 36:21	3 104:11	192:15	185:15,19,
50:15 99:4	105:1	length 91:18	22 186:9
246:14	lead 118:16	177:23	187:24
lapsed 23:10	145:11	178:2	188:3,13
			189:6
large 55:2	leaders	lengthy	190:7,10
66:13	240:17	168:5	196:18
67:15	leading	Leningrad	202:14
189:16	83:18	17:18	204:21
largely	139:20	18:20	205:19,21
107:20	leap 74:2	Lett	206:19
laser 176:16	learn 67:20	220:11,24	208:2
		221:3	209:13,23
late 74:4	learned	letter 94:18	210:2,11
92:15 97:8	67:13	157:20,21,	212:5,11,
108:11	leave 10:8	25 158:3,	16 214:21
113:18	69:21 93:7	6,10	215:5,11
138:12,13	250:2	159:12,14,	216:5,15,
188:22	lecture	18 163:3	19 217:4,
217:13	243:10,12	164:1	23 218:23
Laura 5:4	led 84:7	210:5	219:14
law 60:25	181:15	230:6	221:11,20
61:6 63:24	228:24	236:20	223:2,16
65:1	229:5	237:1	224:19
laws 67:8	left 20:1	241:16,22	229:1
lawsuit 5:23	140:14	243:3	238:22,25
6:1	245:21	letters	239:13
lay 125:6	legacy	98:18	253:16
layers	245:17,21	letting 15:8	Leviwalls@
104:22,24	251:21	level 53:17	myunt.edu
105:17	legal 13:5	levels	185:16
laying	40:9	104:14	Leviwalls@
			myunt.edu.
			185:19

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: liberty..made

liberty	119:14	28:2,7	88:12
130:17	125:23	29:11	96:16,17
	198:7	44:7,13	102:11
lie 226:4	241:18	45:11	176:15
251:15,16		91:10	214:9
life 68:11	listen 250:1	107:15	244:21
82:9	listening	153:19	
87:14,16,	215:14	171:1	lots 251:14
18 108:6	Listserv	190:17	Louisiana
113:13	138:17,20	214:2	47:15
131:19	182:15	217:1	love 213:25
132:11	183:6,12,	long-time	lower 192:14
248:12	17 184:12	230:16	
lifetime	Listservs	233:5	Lucinda
100:5	184:19	longer 32:23	164:21
Likewise	literally	33:23	165:4,17
11:15	56:19	34:10	Ludwig 92:12
limited	58:16 60:1	35:16	lunch 126:14
212:23	168:25	68:25 69:3	190:19,22
limits 25:4	172:14	77:9 85:18	191:1
lines 243:7	252:14	89:18,21	196:8,9
	257:20	149:21	197:10
link 57:12	Litigation	190:2	lying 209:8
69:5	5:11	221:3	lynchings
132:17	lived 18:16	228:2	246:25
133:6,9	87:11	looked 12:17	
169:9	lives 65:20	38:17,21	
linked 69:8	living	85:17	M
list 50:17	246:20	214:16	made 31:17
104:20	249:12	254:1,19	61:24
138:20		loop 67:14	62:12
186:9	located 29:8	lost 69:20	63:17
235:18	48:12	lot 17:3	103:17
listed	logical 92:8	40:15 44:4	144:10
12:15,17	long 16:20	64:10	147:12
118:18	27:18	65:25	178:19
			184:23

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: mail..Mcgill

199:12	making 9:10	maqam 95:14	180:15
mail 30:9,	49:1 60:11	maqams	237:24
22 32:11,	67:16	95:15,16	marks 61:17
15,20	89:21	Marc 18:3	111:22
main 31:15	133:15	March 224:6	Marvin 25:20
35:6	166:21	225:13	26:24
98:14,16	177:17	Marianne	27:4,5
245:18	183:18	34:16 35:9	35:8
maintain	male 56:14	36:10	Mary 5:24
42:22	57:8	257:5	mass 246:25
101:16	59:15,19,	mark 14:23	247:1
maintains	21,23,24	117:11	massacres
92:25	107:25	166:19,24	247:1
major 92:5	maleness	167:3	massive
majority	56:5,6	178:22	222:3
100:12	57:9,13	191:19	master
make 39:22	107:23	205:17	104:15
72:6 81:15	males 251:25	212:21	master's
111:18	man 63:2	226:19	23:2
115:4	80:3	marked 6:21,	masters
134:4	84:21,25	23 7:3	15:20
150:1,21	85:1,2	117:19	72:16
152:18	212:24	130:12,20	74:12
157:14	252:21	159:1,8	masterwork
165:24	254:15	164:9,22	105:12
169:20	Manabe 44:7	179:14	mater
182:16	managing	192:1,11	238:11,12
229:7	142:15	205:22	material
245:15	manifested	206:9	253:11
251:6	55:13	226:21,25	matter 5:3
256:20	65:13	237:19	78:4
makes 87:16	66:25	market 20:7	Mcgill 77:13
91:19	170:16	marking	120:16
127:16	248:9,10	130:18	
224:23	251:9	179:8	

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Index: Michael..multi-volume

23	minus 28:23,	misspeaking	80:25
Michael 5:15	24 212:3,9	229:10	135:12
254:18	minute	misspoke	139:21
Michigan	155:10	232:24	140:4
32:9	174:7	mistake	month 24:23,
mid-december	minutes	134:5	24
217:12	29:14,17	mistaken	months
middle 26:15	30:20	17:22	221:25
87:10	31:17	138:4	233:19
91:10,18	64:14	235:7	morning
95:15	143:25	misunderstand	203:22
171:11	144:1,4	135:20	motion
193:22	254:4	misunderstood	105:18
198:10	mirror	209:5	mouths 57:18
229:24	250:4,6	mocked	move 14:19
million	mis- 187:13	246:13	15:12
96:21	mischaracteriz	model 56:18	43:14 72:4
mind 46:21	es 62:2	moderated	92:7
59:25	misquotation	27:5	226:12
60:10	213:22	Modest 234:4	moved 15:22
61:11	misquote	moment 6:25	120:15
63:20 76:4	165:21	27:10	239:19
127:11	173:12	117:8,14	moves 92:6
128:6	misquoted	191:21	moving
167:2	166:6	222:3	158:17
217:14	171:5	Monday	252:11
222:5,19	173:16	211:25	253:16
223:7	187:13	money 59:5	Mozart 92:13
234:20	misreading	69:1	MTO 122:17
246:18	213:20	monitor 5:7	multi-person
mine 230:16	misrepresent	monograph	25:24
minimal	255:2	48:23 49:1	multi-volume
187:14	misrepresentin	68:21	233:23
minor 92:5	g 210:3,12		
105:5,8,10			

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: music..musics

music	14:23	57:2,3,20,	94:5 95:2,	23 170:19
	15:19	25 58:1,10	3 96:1,5,	178:2
	16:1,4	63:19,22,	7,19,24	182:15
	17:9	25 64:7,12	97:2,6,13	186:3
	19:17,25	65:6,8,13	98:4	190:25
	23:5,12,	66:13	102:13,16,	195:2
	13,16,21,	67:4,13,	19,20,22	201:10,24
	24,25	15,20,24,	103:7,9,24	210:4,7
	24:2,5,9,	25 68:1,6,	104:12,23	232:15
	17 25:9,16	9,11,16	105:3,21,	233:24
	26:18	69:15	23 106:2,	234:1,2,4,
	27:24 28:6	70:18,22	18 107:2,	5 241:15
	29:7	71:10,12,	3,8 108:2	245:2,6,13
	30:19,25	16 72:2,8,	111:13	246:3,19
	31:15	20,22	115:18	247:8,19
	32:5,7	73:6,9,21	116:13,17	248:2,9,19
	33:1,9,16,	74:19,23	119:11,16	249:20
	19,21	75:25 76:7	120:8	250:15
	34:5,6,18	77:3,13,	122:17,22	251:9,18,
	35:2,10	19,21	124:12,20	22 252:1,
	36:15	78:13,18	127:15,18	11 255:5
	39:1,10	79:5,17	130:9,11,	258:10
	42:11,16,	80:1,22	21 131:1,	musical
	22 43:18,	81:21	20 132:12,	16:11
	21 44:1,5,	85:8,9,13,	18 138:24	73:11
	8,21 45:25	15,17,19,	142:12	90:15
	47:3,4,10,	23 86:1,9,	146:11	106:5
	15 48:16,	11,14,17,	157:21	
	17 49:1,2,	18,21 87:9	158:7,8,	musicians
	7 50:14	88:2,4,9,	17,25	73:12
	51:6,24	12,25	159:5	Musicological
	53:6,10,20	89:6,7,11	160:5,11	23:6 29:3
	54:12,19,	90:11,14,	161:14	
	21,25	24 91:4,7	164:19,20	musicology
	55:10,12,	92:1,4,5,	165:3,4	89:13,16
	14,15,19	6,9,10,14,	168:3,9,	252:19
	56:1,15,	20,23	10,23	musics
	18,19	93:8,12,13	169:3,11,	93:12
				95:5

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Lex: musikwissenschaft..number

musikwissenschaft	necessit-	16 110:12	239:10
aft 89:10	15:10	155:18	notes 117:25
<hr/>	needed 18:9	North 6:4,7	165:23
N	27:10	20:3 69:9,	166:21
<hr/>	69:5,6	11 76:7,24	167:7
naive 208:22	154:6	77:2 115:6	notice 7:7
named 115:11	235:4	116:10	notion 108:3
182:6	257:10	118:14	113:10
187:22,24	negative	120:13	143:23
238:2	101:12	142:6,14	November
names 26:25	Neumeyer	147:22	24:22
92:11	53:8	149:22	25:1,2
Naperville	nice 168:18	151:3	26:17
20:2	176:8	152:14,15,	31:11
national	191:1	25 153:13,	147:22
131:18	217:10	25 161:20	201:25
132:11	244:15	162:25	208:12
133:10	Nineteen	179:13	209:9
naturalization	233:2	180:1	211:25
60:25	Nineteenth	181:8	213:11,18
168:13,16	100:22	187:21	216:15
169:10,22	nod 9:15	188:25	217:5
naturalized	nods 9:19	191:5	221:15
61:2	non-white	194:16	229:2
nature 9:8	65:17	195:13	Nu 94:17
59:9 60:24	81:10	196:15	number 5:2,5
107:11	170:16	199:10	6:21,24
128:9	non-whiteness	233:21	28:20
129:8	56:25	Northern	38:17
163:20	nonsensical	18:2	130:18
necessaries	169:21	Norway	161:1,9,
15:10	Noriko 44:7	249:18,25	11,21
necessarily	normal 9:14,	Norwegian	162:17,20
13:2 63:14		250:5	164:10
100:11		note 95:24	199:17
		225:24	207:3

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: numbered..order

208:8	objections	44:2,19	opinion
216:22	241:25	45:25	85:21
226:21	obligated	47:4,11	129:15,17
229:23,24	11:5	48:17 49:7	140:25
237:25	Occasionally	50:14 53:6	151:13,14
243:5	234:21	68:7 79:17	152:7,10
numbered	occurred	81:21 85:8	221:24
160:17	216:19	88:2 98:7,	opinions
numbers	occurs	22 99:1,	141:5,8
180:19,21	246:25	13,14	209:15,16
181:2	October	100:1	228:23
251:15,16	18:23	101:7,12	242:16
numeral	octopus	102:5	253:18
224:16	117:17	108:3	opportunity
numerous	offer 242:19	111:13,24	10:16 41:3
131:16	offered	117:24	195:22
132:8	16:16	124:12	oppose 84:8
nursing	offers 16:6	127:18	opposing
22:22	official	130:12,21	204:10
nutshell	33:12	159:7	opposite
248:4	oftenness	178:3	235:1
o	94:6	192:11	oral 43:8
oath 11:3	Ohio 63:1	open 30:13	orchestra
Oberlin 51:6	oldest 65:15	128:9	65:16,18,
object 13:11	one-page	129:8	23 66:6,9
166:5	191:25	157:20,25	71:7
236:3	192:6	158:3,6,9	orchestras
objection	online 30:2,	163:3	67:1 71:5,
151:11	4,7,13	164:1	24
165:24	31:8,10,12	210:5	order 16:23
187:15	33:16,19,	248:17	27:11 57:4
objectionable	21 35:23	253:2	108:11
187:10,11	43:18,21	openly	113:18
		223:16	151:9
		opera 66:16,	168:16
		17 67:11	

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: ordered..paper

231:5	145:12	259:6	159:12,16,
259:2	164:12	pack 117:24	21 166:22
ordered	originals	159:8	167:3,9,
150:3	101:10	192:12	13,18
ordering	Oslo 249:20	package	170:5,8
108:4	Oster 88:19	34:23	185:5
113:11	Oswald 88:18	packet	193:22
161:4	245:24	164:13	210:22
ordinary	other's	199:17	222:6,10
46:13	121:4,10,	207:23	256:4
149:9,13	22	pages 8:7	258:11
organization	outline	46:13	Panama-
23:15	48:23	99:12,18,	colombia
organizations	outlined	21,23	69:12
23:4	50:22	100:4	pandemic
240:21	outlines	101:17,23	172:8
organized	154:6	125:11	panel 27:16
32:14,16	outlook	228:3	119:11
organizing	108:6	Painter	147:7,16,
32:20	113:13	5:18,19	21 148:4
origin	outward-facing	7:9 39:13	153:1,7,10
121:18	196:20	40:8,11,	179:12,25
original	owned 58:25	15,18,21	181:14
44:20,24	owners 62:13	43:1 62:1,	188:6,11
45:10	65:9	5 64:10	191:4
60:21,22		69:25	204:16
69:17		75:1,4,6,	211:20
99:8,13		12 111:5,	218:8
101:7	P	12,18	226:25
136:18	p.m. 114:25	112:4,6,9,	227:13,20
161:6	130:7	12,16,24	237:4
originally	200:6	113:4	panel's
19:12	217:6	151:11,19	148:8
44:13 97:7	237:16	152:1,6	panic 96:16
	244:3	155:14,20,	paper 28:7
		24 156:3,6	33:21 34:1

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: paper's..Peabody

38:24	212:19	201:6	past 42:23
43:16,20	213:5	230:12,13	44:6 56:16
44:16,20	228:11	231:21	74:1 85:17
47:8	230:1	245:4	86:14
124:19	243:6,7	250:14,16	156:8
125:15,22	paragraphs	partial 9:19	224:16
145:21	125:9		248:16
146:2		participate	249:16
165:25	parallels	143:9,15	
166:6	88:13	172:24	patriarchal
208:18	paren 228:9	174:23	66:1
209:1,4		178:13	248:16
217:25	part 10:6	183:10	251:8
257:2,4,5	17:4	184:8,22	patriarchy
259:2	22:11,13,	185:2	57:13,15
	14 23:16,	186:14	58:6,8
paper's	20 25:23		61:11
212:20	45:16	participated	65:25
papers 33:18	60:20,22	175:16	84:22 85:3
38:4,7	66:5 67:25	participation	248:7
44:11,15	68:1 74:8	141:16	255:6
45:3	78:9 80:5,	228:14	
125:22	19 81:12,		Patricia
138:3,11	13 92:20	particulars	30:12,17,
140:12	105:22	152:22	18 31:25
144:24	112:10	partly	32:3
162:12	136:18	230:15	Paul 72:25
182:24	140:21	parts 62:19	73:24
183:5,18	144:21	95:11	
186:8,22	145:14	105:23	pay 21:8
187:11	148:18	181:11	216:1
221:7	154:9		PDF 12:19
223:4	157:14	party 145:20	13:24 14:7
231:9	162:12	pass 35:7	38:22
	168:24	254:5	189:7
paragraph	169:4	255:24	257:7,11,
125:8	170:24		22 259:3
132:16	175:22	passed	
171:13	195:16	136:15	Peabody 73:1

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: peace..personal

peace 19:1	96:17,21,	peoples	157:11
	22 98:24	93:11	246:23
pedagogy	101:14		
190:16,25	108:9	per- 16:13	Perry 47:14,
peer 36:1,	110:20	percent	15 48:19
5,15,17	113:16	56:19	49:7 53:7
37:12,23	114:5	210:9	person 41:14
38:13,18,	117:10	249:5,6,7	56:13 60:1
21,24	129:20	251:17	61:5
42:8,13,	130:19	256:23	65:17,23
17,23	132:19		76:13
46:16 53:1	145:13	percentage	81:5,9,10
122:11,20,	159:7	249:1,2	83:13
23 123:1	164:11	perfect	115:16
124:13,15,	168:25	10:17	144:5
21 125:16	169:1	52:21	145:12
126:11,19	176:20	perfectly	149:10
127:9,13	177:5	9:16	162:3
148:14,16,	184:13,18	110:12	172:10
23 176:25	189:6	155:18	178:15
235:21	190:20	156:22	183:19
242:3	191:8	246:17,18	190:19
256:7	192:11		196:24,25
258:7,9	197:10	performance	197:4,8
	217:25	16:14	233:22
pen 166:17	219:25	performance-	235:20
people 16:14	236:6,19	oriented	244:16
18:17	239:23	17:1	245:20,23
25:18	248:13,23	performances	247:8
27:3,7	249:4,10	55:17	248:20
30:9,21	250:7,22,	performed	257:18
47:25	25 251:17	66:18	
49:13	255:22		personal
56:6,11,13	257:14	performing	11:24
57:24	258:3	67:10	37:6,8
58:9,20		71:23	41:22
60:7	people's		62:20 82:9
67:12,23	67:21	period 92:15	242:20
73:6 83:19		97:8 124:1	253:10,17,

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: personally..plenary

19	66:4,15,25	piece	105:3,	96:22
personally	67:10	4,10	106:5	planned
63:6 69:13	71:5,23	116:8		194:12,19,
77:22	Philip 5:3,	257:2,5		20,23
153:24	19 6:9 7:2	pieces	55:17	203:2,18
175:15	119:15	177:12		planning
230:24	130:11	Pimp 44:2		194:15
231:19	174:2,4,8	45:6,23		platform
perspective	184:1,2	pitches		242:22
56:4	191:9	93:14		plausible
pertaining	207:6	pivot	120:19	222:21,23
12:4	237:18	place	15:3	play 65:17
Petersburg	258:18	25:6		66:3
15:25	phone 14:25	145:19		played
16:18	51:8	154:15		232:21
17:11,14	176:21	195:7		player 66:4
18:15,21	phrase	places	41:20	playing 71:6
19:9	198:18	214:21		192:22
petition	phraseology	plaintiff		pleasure
236:13	78:1	5:17		254:7
Ph.d. 16:1,7	phrenologists	Plaintiff's		plenary
17:9 19:17	67:22	7:1 117:18		24:5,8
248:19	phrenology	130:8		25:12,24
phase 49:24	114:14	158:24		26:17
224:13	physical	164:17		27:5,18
phenomenon	189:10	179:10		29:16
97:19	physically	191:24		33:18,20,
Phil 196:3	239:24	205:20		23 34:3,4,
231:5	physics	226:23		21 35:2,
250:22	94:15,17	237:17		10,25 36:8
Philadelphia	picking	plan	171:16	38:25
58:20	101:22	172:17		39:2,9
philharmonic	picture	planet	57:25	42:7 43:3,
65:14	254:17	93:12		8,17 79:9

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Index: poignant..preliminary

84:15	231:10	20:9	potential
122:14,22	245:18	196:2,12	95:9
137:2	253:8	240:17	161:13
139:16		253:22	
142:20	pointing		potentially
144:3,12	83:11	positions	96:20
145:22	156:19	21:15	129:6
146:3,8,9,	249:23	71:23	188:16
18 174:8	points	positive	Powell
177:7	147:11	47:13 49:4	254:18
187:17,18	155:6	67:17	
201:5,9,25	158:15		power 69:1
224:23	161:12	positively	92:25 93:1
256:9,11,	162:1,5,9	108:19	197:25
14,15,19	165:12	possession	231:19
257:12,21,	177:16	39:16,17,	251:18
25 258:8,9	221:22	24 40:16	practice
	235:24	possibly	97:24
poignant		67:23	190:17
246:15	policies	149:7	
	160:5		praising
point 19:19	163:5	post 175:24	250:23
25:19,23		194:10	
28:23	policy	198:10	pre- 121:9
30:8,11	160:10	205:3,19,	pre-tenure
35:24 48:6	161:1,9	21 209:8	235:7
54:18 63:2	163:13,23		236:5,6
66:2 81:2	164:3,5	post-soviet	precisely
122:19	political	18:11	9:12
134:6	108:11	posted	
136:22	113:18	204:21	prefaced
142:24		205:2	151:16
156:23	popular		
162:20	246:7	posting	prefer 84:4
177:6	portion	209:24	157:16
198:23	29:16	postings	187:7
213:19	portions	198:21	preferred
214:1	179:2	posts 51:14,	183:13,15
215:6	position	16 205:11	preliminary
			15:10

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Index: preparation..process

preparation	241:2,10,	75:4	192:6
14:2 40:23	11	116:23	prior 131:15
prepare	presidents	123:6	196:16
11:22	241:10	197:24	priori
13:15	press 118:14	246:5	105:11
presence 9:9	149:22	247:18	private
present	152:16	prevailed	97:1,3
15:16 21:3	224:11	53:21	privilege
27:13	225:10	prevent	59:15,17
57:21	Press' 154:1	143:8	privileged
86:17	pressure	236:17	12:24 13:3
125:3	193:19	prevented	14:18
226:7	196:19	143:14	privileges
presentation	251:4	previous	55:4,10,21
43:17	pressured	203:6	57:6 64:19
120:24	204:8,9	205:25	84:21 85:3
142:19	221:6	219:1	privy 34:25
207:7	pressures	pried 191:10	152:24
253:18	253:21	primary 97:6	pro-ewell
presentations	presume	Primer	221:6
201:9	145:10	119:17	pro-white
presented	191:7	principle	90:13
28:15	199:2	161:8,21	107:8
38:25 43:8	205:10	162:17	prob- 149:11
49:13	221:19	principles	problematic
226:24	231:20	160:14	212:25
227:12	236:20	print 34:7	213:2
253:12	presumed	35:14,15,	problems
254:19	188:15	19 43:7	249:16
presenting	presuming	printed 34:2	251:21
204:18	197:21	192:15	process
presents	pretty 21:12	printout	34:13
56:13	25:3	158:25	42:13 47:9
president	65:10,11	159:4	
32:4			

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: processes..provision

48:15	6:14 19:25	20:5 21:6	promoting
58:13	20:3,19,24		92:21
120:4	32:6,7	profile	
125:21,24	34:18 44:8	254:17	promotion
126:3	47:15 48:7	program	20:19
139:24	50:6 51:7	15:21,23	promulgated
154:3	53:10	17:20,22	163:6
157:14	75:22	25:14,18	pronounce
256:13	77:12	26:23,25	121:12
258:7	115:5,8,10	28:16	pronounced
processes	116:12	72:21	
122:11	118:3	74:11 76:7	22:3
	123:25		225:14
produce 95:7	130:17	programs	proper
	142:11	16:2,6,7	145:24
produced	144:18	71:12	146:6,7
14:6,12	152:12	72:2,9	
39:18	153:19	74:22,23	properly
40:22	155:3	progression	41:23
180:22	159:11,24	92:8	propertied
181:8	164:16,18,	progressions	58:25
production	24 165:2	96:3	proposal
224:14	180:14	project	124:19
232:13,16	185:12	233:19	propped
profession	200:10	prolific	57:21
160:15	237:24	98:11	prospective
professional	248:25	prominent	203:8
12:1 16:4	252:19	216:22	protect
19:20 20:4	professors	promise	207:8
23:4 31:18	83:3	226:9	prove 73:12
52:15	123:23	promoted	proved 67:22
151:8,18	142:5	20:16,20,	provided
152:13	147:7	23	152:7
177:21	248:24	promotes	211:19
199:11	249:3,8	160:13	provision
215:9	251:15		62:6
professor	professorship		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: pseudoscientific..put

pseudoscientif	242:2,23	134:13,18	68:17
ic 246:11	253:12	135:10,22	70:18
pub- 150:4	257:22	136:8,13	200:13
public 151:3	publications	137:10,17	purposes
publically	33:13 42:7	139:2	9:17 39:23
111:23	51:3	140:8	40:4
publication	53:16,19	147:21	237:25
34:6 36:2	126:23	149:21	252:10
37:13	129:22	150:5,6	pushback
38:14	publish	153:10,17,	198:24
41:18 47:9	34:20	25 157:22	pushed
49:15	51:23	177:5	53:13,15
125:7	134:15	178:7	245:11
126:4	141:13,19	201:10,15,	put 8:22
139:21	218:12,13	23 210:5	12:19
141:25	220:15	220:23	13:24
146:15,24	221:6	223:1	31:21 48:3
147:4	published	242:21	55:14,25
148:24	28:4 32:24	254:18	56:20
149:15	33:8,18,20	258:1,2,5	57:18 58:2
150:4,10,	34:5,8	publishing	85:10
12,13	35:3,10	34:13	90:16
151:9,10	36:1 43:5,	48:16	95:24
161:4,5,7	17,21	118:7	128:25
162:15	45:7,8,19,	119:7	138:18
175:20	24 47:3	120:4	139:13
177:3,11	49:19	125:21	142:7
181:16	50:13,17	134:24	143:6
195:18	53:25	142:3	144:4
203:8,11	57:20	150:4	147:8
204:11	79:16	152:16	155:4
209:12	111:15	198:25	156:5
221:14	116:9	220:19	157:20
224:24	125:11,16	pulled 44:17	231:12
235:17,19	126:15,18	45:13	242:10,11
236:14	127:9,17	purpose	247:14
240:1	130:11	10:10 41:6	248:22

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: putting..quotes

257:10	68:3 69:18	210:23,24	258:12,14
putting	70:15	211:2,4,8,	quick 138:6
38:21	71:11,14	10 218:5	Quimby 5:24
86:19	72:4 73:17	222:14	quotation
120:20	74:16,20	242:11	111:22
233:23	78:13	247:10,13,	112:1,7,14
247:4	80:4,15	21,23,25	113:9
	88:20 90:5	248:17,18	131:22
<hr/> Q <hr/>	91:8,23	252:3	
	102:25	254:22	quotations
Q&as 146:11	103:2,5	256:6	140:17
qualify	106:18,22	questioning	165:25
128:6	109:6,12,	76:4	167:25
215:3	13,16	questions	quote 55:6
qualms	113:6	6:20 8:5,9	57:5
213:17	114:17	10:19 12:4	108:2,17,
Quartet 18:4	127:23	13:9 15:13	19 110:25
Queens 15:21	132:22,23	44:23 54:4	112:21
	135:5,16,	75:24	116:23
question	20,24	77:18	129:10
8:13,21	137:9,15,	126:14	131:9,12,
9:20,22,24	18 146:5	133:16	15 132:5
10:4,11	149:6	143:5,7	153:1
11:9,10,	151:17	151:22	168:2,5,21
12,15,17	153:22	166:3	171:12
26:16	155:13,18	176:6,7	179:24
38:10 40:9	156:11	200:11	193:18
42:14	158:2	205:25	222:4,19
52:11,22	161:6	226:10,16	quoted
56:22	162:14	227:9	108:16
57:10	163:18	231:6,14	109:8
59:12	168:11	234:16	110:11
60:18 62:8	170:8	243:20	112:21
63:16	185:12	244:8	172:23
64:22 65:5	190:6	252:16	quotes
66:10,23	199:23	253:6	139:14
67:3,4	205:24	254:13,25	165:13
	209:22		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: quoting..read

166:14	44:22 47:5	racism 77:11	221:22
quoting	48:16	84:3 85:17	raises 21:8
108:18	54:11,13,	135:11	raising
132:25	17,20,24	164:19	163:22
	55:3,9	165:3	
<hr/>	64:7,11,18	243:3,11,	ran 115:19
R	65:6,7	13 246:8	rank 21:4
<hr/>	66:23	249:24	197:19
R&r 50:3	67:5,7,22	racist	rare 83:13
rabbit 157:4	68:7,16	76:17,20,	rarely
249:17	70:16,17,	21 77:16	205:11
250:11	22 71:18	83:18,21	Rasse 100:10
race 44:6	72:7,22	85:16	Raz 233:22
57:14	74:16	134:24,25	re-notice
65:11	77:19,21,	135:3,6,	7:2,15
100:1,6,	25 78:7,	10,11,15,	8:15,19
10,11,12,	11,13,17	17,19,23,	reach
14,19,21,	79:5,19	25 136:3	145:11,15
23 101:2,	80:1 88:4,	208:21	157:13
11,25	9 90:2,10,	209:6,25	235:13
135:11	18 107:9	213:2,21	242:3
246:2,25	127:15	222:18	reached
247:1,17	130:10	246:12,21,	175:15,19
248:1	131:2,18	23 251:1	177:9
255:5	132:10	racist,'	252:13
races 56:24	133:10	168:9	read 36:8
114:15	168:3,24	Radical	55:16 99:5
Rachel	169:11,23	62:21 63:1	106:15
237:19	245:10,13	ragas 95:13	110:5
238:2,8,	246:8	raise 154:14	113:21
21,23	247:9	164:2,4	119:18
239:11,19,	249:15,16	176:2,9,13	121:4,10,
24 241:11	251:19	187:15	22 131:9
243:10	racialized	raised	132:20
racial 24:9,	56:3 57:2	158:15	133:1
17 27:25	racially	164:1	
28:6 33:2	92:22		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Index: reading..reconstruction

139:1,5,7,	230:17	253:10,14	received
13 140:8,	232:18		8:12 16:17
12 141:1,	242:7	reasonable	25:9,11
14 147:6,	257:3,12,	101:5	30:1 46:22
9,13,16	21	156:22	84:16
148:7		221:18	144:24
152:25	reading	223:12	182:17
157:12	78:10	rebuttals	184:7,11,
161:15,22	101:5,6	171:16	14,21
165:6	194:7,10	172:16	185:2
166:1,8,9	205:13		186:11
168:19	206:2	rec- 163:8	
169:6	225:24	recall	recess 26:8
171:16,18	252:24	37:16,19,	75:17
172:16,24	realize 56:4	22 38:18	114:24
173:1,11,	57:15	101:13,15	130:6
13 174:16	realizing	115:15	200:5
175:11	56:21	120:6,22	237:15
177:10		122:5,22	244:2
179:1	reason	126:3,8,12	recognize
181:25	42:10,15,	127:12	8:14
185:20	19 73:14	135:8	182:11
194:13	80:9,19	136:20	238:4
198:15	89:6	148:2	
201:11	99:20,22	163:10	recoll-
203:12	102:22	164:4	159:16
205:1,3,11	125:20	165:23	recollection
206:13	141:17	172:2,9	37:11
207:14	149:6	191:13	113:20
208:23	165:20	204:23	125:17
211:3,6	171:4	214:17,22	158:5
216:25	178:11,14,	215:7,11	188:2,20
217:18	18 186:7	218:1	194:4
219:22	197:8	242:5	236:15
220:16	226:3		240:25
221:21	231:18	receive	
224:25	235:3	182:20	recommendation
226:1	236:2	183:9	49:16
	245:16	184:6	reconstruction

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: record..remember

62:24	180:23	reference	regrets
record 9:2,	181:12,20	163:23	232:19
11,18	182:13	referenced	regular
11:21 12:9	191:20	209:11	233:12,14
13:8 16:9	198:16	referred	relate
21:21	200:2,4,8	21:22	247:15
26:3,7,11	205:18	118:9	related
35:12	226:20	referred-to	42:17
36:14	237:12,14,	211:5	106:13,16
39:6,15,	22,25	referring	161:14
20,22 40:7	239:5	24:2 60:4,	169:23
41:2 49:12	241:14	15 111:7	228:25
63:3 75:7,	243:22	118:25	relationship
11,20 87:5	244:1,5,17	119:12	103:22
91:2,13,	255:18	121:11,24	104:1
17,25	258:24	155:21,25	107:10
104:11	recorded	171:20	110:18
111:2	165:22	181:1	114:2,12
112:19	recording	194:18	136:7,21
114:20,23	257:1	196:23	245:1
115:2,13,	records	208:18,25	relationships
25 117:5,	38:7,13	239:7	200:15
9,22 125:6	39:16,17	reflect 12:9	relaxation
130:3,5,	41:22,23	reformed	50:4
15,18,23	42:23	85:8	relevant
131:10	204:15	Reframing	12:17 48:7
133:1	recouple	25:16	165:10
134:5	132:17	refuse 70:13	relied 107:2
145:5	recoupling	regard 104:4	relying
147:20	133:5	107:23	101:7,9
155:5,13	REDIRECT	213:6	remarkable
156:5	254:10	regional	224:24
159:4	refer 46:7	23:22	remember
164:9,13	72:24,25	regret 230:8	24:19
165:1	105:4		
167:8,16	199:16		
178:23			
179:8			

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Index: remembered..residing

25:19	remove	30:20	231:24	Republican
26:25	removed			62:21 63:2
36:12		30:6,8	reporter	
42:4,6			5:9,13	republication
44:6 46:24	Renaldo	6:5	6:25 7:8	258:8
64:22	repeat	38:10	9:1 26:1	republish
115:16		42:14 49:3	46:4 63:10	256:16
122:10		55:8 69:17	117:6,8,	republished
123:11		77:14	14,17	256:15
138:16		78:12	177:24	
147:19,25		103:13	191:21	reputation
148:20		222:14	192:3	41:16
159:17			211:6	request
163:5,8,22	repeatedly		259:4	38:17 39:6
165:15		184:23	reports	247:23
187:12	repertoire		174:17	requested
188:7		55:18,23,	repository	12:12,18
189:11,21		24	98:22,23	38:16
191:16	rephrase		represent	requests
192:18		61:21 83:7	7:15 96:19	46:5 63:11
204:20		91:23	165:1	177:25
206:2		135:20	179:21	217:16
214:11	replication		224:8	requires
218:7,14,		43:13	representative	10:5
16 238:6	replied		100:4	reread
remembered		153:6	represented	110:23
120:1	reply	153:6	92:14	112:25
235:24	replying		227:7	113:9
remembers		189:17	representing	201:20
112:20	report		229:17	research
remind 178:4		147:17	237:3	43:16
remote		148:8	represents	reserve
130:19		153:1,7,	107:7	255:25
215:4		10,16	183:25	residing
remotely		174:15	reproduce	6:10
244:16		218:8	257:7	

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: respect..reviewing

respect	44:20,25	responsive	123:2
12:11	153:9,17	39:5,25	124:21
104:1	162:3	40:9,13	126:3,11,
161:12	174:7	rest 50:4	19 127:2,3
162:4,8	175:25	97:19	148:14,16,
175:23	192:25		23 159:23
234:18	194:11	resubmit	183:2
	195:23,25	49:10	208:6
respond	217:4,9,12	50:3,20,25	226:24
139:9	225:24	53:4 80:17	227:12,19
143:24	230:10	82:2	235:21
144:15	254:24	result	242:3
154:11	255:16	198:12	256:7
162:11		251:14,19	258:7
184:15,18	responses		
	137:2	resulted	reviewed
responded	139:13,14,	27:17	42:8
143:7	15 140:8	retired 51:4	46:16,22
154:5	141:1	53:10 78:2	53:1
176:4	143:6		122:11,23
184:19	144:4,7,11	retrievable	124:13,24
231:13	176:6	190:2	125:16
255:13	183:21	retrospect	127:9,13
respondent	198:12	230:3,8	176:25
145:8	203:10		258:9
225:22	216:21	return 17:10	
responding	220:12,15,	63:19	reviewer
36:12	19,22	returning	123:6,7
37:19	221:19	65:5	reviewer's
46:24	229:1	review 36:2,	37:17,20
144:6	230:10	5,15,17,	reviewers
145:13	231:3,8	24,25	36:12
162:3	responsibility	37:4,12,15	37:1,8
176:20	207:8	38:13,18,	46:18
		21,24	reviewers'
response	responsible	41:4,18	46:22,25
8:18 14:6,	58:8,11	42:13,17	reviewing
13 32:12	178:12,19	122:21	192:5
43:25	216:21		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: reviews..Schenker's

reviews	97:3	53:23	152:23
37:23		58:17	
42:23	Riemann	81:24	Schenker
47:12 49:4	97:15 98:2	160:7	86:25
80:16	right-hand	176:20	87:2,4,7,
124:16	192:14		23 88:3
		running	90:2,6,9,
revise 49:10	rigorous	100:19	16 97:5,18
50:20,25	255:15		98:3,7,13,
53:4 80:17	road 9:12	Russia 15:24	21 99:14,
82:2 83:25	16:3	18:7,8	25 101:6,
		36:24	12,25
revise-and-	role 63:22,	Russian	102:4
resubmit	25 180:2	18:16	104:2,6
49:16	187:20	116:16	105:13
revised 50:2	190:9	119:11,16	106:22
	229:14	120:8	108:5,14
revision	232:20,22	121:16,17	113:12
80:16		195:2	131:17
revisions	room 8:4	234:1,5	132:9
49:5,18	rooted 54:22		133:13
50:9,16,24	58:4	Russianist	143:25
54:1 80:17		77:7 195:3	144:2,3
	roughly	232:3	208:18
rewrote	22:18		212:24
45:16	56:10		245:9,13,
	68:23	s	17,18,19
Rezvoi 234:5	92:14,18	sake 125:5	246:1,6,11
rich 96:19	144:3	Salzer 88:18	247:3,7
Richard 5:18	194:21	Sanford	251:22
7:5 156:10	249:6	65:20	
166:21	routine 73:5		Schenker's
177:12		Satz 98:15	99:4,13
179:7	rubric	save 253:7	101:12
221:1	174:10		102:7,13,
	rulebook	scale 105:20	17 106:18
Richmond	59:1,8	scare 139:14	107:3,20
228:5,6		scenes 58:14	114:2,13
230:7	rules 9:12	80:7 96:17	131:18
rid 85:5	51:14,23,		
	25 52:7,13		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: Schenkerian..sense

132:10,17	190:12,22	234:10	section
133:11	191:14	246:2	131:5
212:20	193:4	school 22:22	234:4
245:2	195:18	67:13 77:3	Seegal
251:20	198:4	82:23	177:13
Schenkerian	199:6	111:12	Segall
133:20,25	207:9	199:12	116:12
134:7,16,	209:12	232:15	120:20
23 135:9,	210:6,20	252:13	121:21
19 136:7	211:11	schools 76:2	125:23
137:11	213:4	science	Segall's
140:3	227:15	89:11	123:17
141:13,18	231:21	scope 28:25	segregation
142:2	233:20	29:7	246:8
143:10	242:1	Scots 58:22	segregationism
146:16	Schenkerians	script	251:19
147:3	216:22	257:15	select 58:2
148:4	217:14	scripted	selected
149:4,17,	Schichte	257:20	25:12
21 150:6	104:22	scrutiny	26:16
152:16	scholar	183:20	selecting
154:1,17,	108:15	186:19	27:16
21 157:23	128:7	search 38:6,	58:9,12
158:13	129:18	12 168:13	selection
162:7,16,	scholars	214:14	58:13
23 163:4,	65:11	searched	selective
24 171:22	78:23	102:1,4	179:2
173:8,9,	88:21	214:12	sending
10,17,19	160:21	Seashore	30:21
175:11	247:17	73:9	238:6
178:7	248:2	seat 252:7	sense 29:2,9
180:2	scholarship	Sebastian	52:19
182:23	78:24	92:12	55:22
183:10,22	110:13		90:11
184:23	161:13		
185:3,7	196:20		
188:16			
189:3			

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: sentence..single

125:1,15	session	shortly	198:13,19
127:16	25:15,24	147:18	199:3,4
154:2	27:6	show 251:6	225:5
157:13	29:16,23	showed	silent
161:25	30:12	210:13	117:15
162:18,19	31:23 43:3	shown 28:11	silly 252:3
177:8	84:15	47:23	similar
245:12	116:15	231:23	83:4,6
sentence	122:6	shows 112:19	169:9
132:3,16	144:3	Shut 66:19	247:14
193:12	187:17,19	sic 57:18	simple 96:11
194:6	201:5	133:19	102:22
201:3	sessions	201:21	105:18
203:7	42:8	242:22	151:25
207:5	set 258:4	side 8:24	168:13
208:16	sets 127:5	99:7,8,9	simpler
228:17,21	settings	sided 82:24	222:2
231:1	73:22	sign 128:5	simplest
sentences	sevens	signatories	simply 10:15
194:5	223:22	158:9,10	14:24 15:2
separate	seventies	210:8	66:2
34:3 47:2	252:20	signed	107:18
Separately	severed	202:10	143:5
142:17	132:17	218:23	151:14
September	133:6	236:19,25	157:14
5:6	sexist 251:1	significant	176:5
sequentially	shift 96:11	100:7	181:15
29:21	short 29:1	101:18,20,	230:10
series	63:14	21 193:19	250:11
119:12	75:23	234:6,9	sincerely
180:23	91:10	signing	198:13
service 66:4	116:10	236:18	242:23
serving	126:20	silence	single 36:23
123:19	247:10		209:18,19

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Index: singly-anonymous..solely

singly-anonymous	slides	186:2	society
36:25	142:19, 24	201:5	23:5, 6, 12,
singly-blind	slightly	207:6	13, 16, 20,
36:18	85:18	208:18	22, 24
sir 191:22	97:16	209:1, 18	24:2, 5
sit 42:3	205:14	222:17	25:9 26:18
148:22	212:24	224:23	29:4, 7
204:25	255:3	236:20	30:19, 25
situation	slot 28:17	SMT-ANNOUNCE	31:15 32:5
149:12	Slottow	186:9	33:8 34:6
193:10	142:9, 18	Smt-announce@	35:2 39:1,
248:22	144:18	societymusicth	9 42:11,
skimmed	188:10	eory.org.	16, 22
207:1	202:15	182:10	51:24 52:6
skin 100:22	220:2	Snyder	53:20 56:7
skip 161:11	231:24	252:17	66:13
171:8	smack 229:24	so-called	115:18
194:5	small 116:10	56:15	124:19
202:1	198:6	105:3	138:24
207:2	249:17	153:6	157:21
216:12	SMT 24:1, 25	193:15	158:7, 17,
217:3	27:8 28:19	204:16	25 159:5
223:20	30:16	211:20	160:4, 11
224:16	81:17	218:7	186:3
228:3	84:15	227:12	210:4, 7
229:19	119:11, 25	237:4	250:17
slaughtered	138:17, 20,	social 22:23	sociological
246:24	24 142:20	128:11	54:18
slave 60:20	144:24	141:2, 4	sociologist
62:13 65:9	158:20	222:3, 17	54:14 78:3
69:1	159:8	230:14	sociologists
slaves 59:1	160:10	societies	248:1
slide 256:19	161:9	23:4 29:2	sole 181:4
	162:21	52:12, 15	224:21
	163:3, 12,	160:4	solely
	22 183:5		178:12

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: solicit..standards

227:13	spans	125:11	specifically	spoke	43:13
solicit	speak	11:10	38:20 53:7	109:25	
122:1	91:20 99:3		57:3 59:13	144:2	
216:21	154:10		74:6	172:9	
223:4,5	210:9		135:15	235:10	
solicitation	234:20		184:10,11	256:23	
122:4	236:7,8		195:17	spoken	
Somali	240:14		236:16	163:13	
250:8			247:12	235:4	
son	speaker		Spectrum	236:3	
172:14	216:1		34:5,8,14	244:18	
sort	speakers		35:11,13	spread	213:2
202:4	27:16		36:1 37:13	spring	32:1
225:4	speaking		38:13	st	15:25
sorts	25:19 57:9		41:18 42:8	16:18	
175:25	257:15,17		43:5 81:19	17:11,14	
sought	spearheading		122:17	18:15,21	
214:3,6	233:25		126:16	19:9	
sound	special		127:22	staff	
93:16,	16:23		201:10,15,	178:16,20	
17,18,21	137:9		24 203:8	stamp	192:13
169:21	204:13		speculating	stances	
209:3	224:9,10		145:9	108:9	
217:20	specialty		speculation	113:16	
sounding	89:9		63:7 222:6	stand	70:14
95:5	specific		speech	148:8	
sounds	71:19		61:16	standard	
18:17	75:24 76:9		62:11	144:8	
53:3 58:12	83:18		spell	146:22	
73:15	106:17		111:1	149:1,14	
87:16	128:19		spend	153:15	
136:9	156:7		217:2	176:19	
169:21	183:19		spent	199:10	
196:6	242:13		Spicer	standards	
220:18	247:24		14:23		
source	253:25		spills		
108:15			202:12		
Soviet			219:7		
18:10,17					

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: stands..struck

183:14,24	97:4 98:5	250:23	strains
stands 46:21	109:19	251:10	107:6
193:4	110:16,17	stations	strange
241:13	112:25	169:19	138:8
Stanford	114:1	statistic	140:18,22
15:17	158:20,22	251:12	141:9,22
start 17:12	159:9		184:2
71:2,8	184:21	status 82:2	strangely
155:3	201:19,22	steady	43:25
187:24	statements	108:10	Straus 25:21
247:2	63:17	113:17	26:22
start- 224:2	states 16:15	Steffy 66:6	28:12 35:8
started 9:7	19:6 29:8	step 183:16	street 6:10
96:23	55:1 56:23	Stephen	115:20
119:20	57:21,22	142:9,17	strict 108:3
221:11	58:4,9	188:10	113:10
starting	61:14	202:15	strike
15:15	62:19 64:3	221:3	125:19
17:13	66:2,24	steps 67:17	158:1
172:9	69:2,4,6,	Steven	232:10
state 10:15	10 70:18,	231:24	254:23
16:9 23:14	23 72:22	sticks 28:20	strikes
47:15	78:18 79:6	stir 208:19	208:22
85:25	81:13	stop 94:12	string
87:15	83:13 89:3	121:9	228:24
129:11	90:4 96:8	150:13	229:1
135:12	106:24	152:16	strong
151:5,8,	107:21	174:3,9	103:14
21,24	150:25	stopped	strongly
161:19	168:12,17	150:10,11	160:4
209:22	170:21	story 247:5	struck
stated	171:2,3	Stowers 6:5,	140:21
230:25	219:1	6	141:21
statement	245:3,7		
10:7 52:8	246:16		
	248:8		
	249:13		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: struct-..subpoena

struct-	16:24	24 171:22	141:11
105:2	55:18	173:8,9,	sub- 138:9
structural	56:17	10,17,19,	subcontinent
105:17	71:10,12	20 175:11	95:14
169:4	72:16	178:7	subframe
170:2,11	74:21	180:2	90:13
243:3	76:5,23	182:23	107:8
251:7,8	88:15 90:3	183:10,22	subheading
structure	188:13,15	184:23	228:8
61:8	196:13	185:3,8	subject
105:2,18	240:12,15,	188:16	161:14
106:4	21 241:23	189:4	231:2
232:21	252:14	190:12,22	subjected
structures	studied	191:15	125:23
69:14	18:2,3	193:5	126:11,18
104:25	86:24	195:18	submission
106:12	studies	198:4	141:20
170:25	133:20,25	199:6	220:5
struggles	134:7,16,	209:12	submissions
83:4,6	23 135:9,	210:6,20	141:21
student	19 136:8	211:11	submit 27:15
67:19 73:1	137:11	227:15	138:9
74:12,13	140:3	231:22	177:10
185:23	141:13,18	233:21	submitted
188:1,2,8	142:2	242:1	14:1 36:7
189:1	143:10	246:2	47:10
190:11	146:16	studio 45:4	121:3
196:14,15,	147:4	study 15:24	179:11,24
18 197:13,	148:5	17:18,21	subordinate
22 206:20	149:4,17,	18:7,14	106:4
213:10	21 150:6	55:16	subpoena
238:9	152:17	56:20	8:11,14,19
240:17,19,	154:1,17,	57:14	12:4,16
20,24	21 157:23	72:13,20	14:6,13,21
241:1,12	158:13	73:1	
students	162:8,16,	stuff 18:2	
	23 163:4,	89:22	

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Index: subscribe..symposium

15:2 38:16	suggestion	supports	surmise 82:5
39:25	134:22	61:18	84:10,11,
subscribe	174:2	suppose	12,14
184:12	suggestions	127:10	surprise
subscriber	229:7	225:23	122:23
138:19	suicide	227:16	surprised
subsection	87:17	241:23	51:21,22
131:8	sum 168:15	supposed	136:19
substance	214:22	227:14	Suzannah
13:5 54:4	summarize	supposedly	220:25
substantive	49:17	199:5	swear 5:13
191:17	143:17	suppressing	swirling
216:9	244:25	161:5,7	44:4
229:7	summary	162:15	sworn 6:11
substituted	57:17	suppression	symphony
183:19	summer 17:15	161:18	65:15
succinctly	32:2	supremacist	symposia
244:25	249:18	61:7 65:12	187:8
sudden 223:6	sup- 61:24	66:11	symposium
suffering	superior	170:25	45:23
10:24	106:9	248:16	137:2,10,
suggest	superiority	251:8	17,22
41:10	170:13	257:19	139:2,10
175:14	support	supremacy	140:9,11,
209:7	36:22	54:23	12,21
suggested	59:15,21,	57:16,22	141:7,14,
25:22	23 61:25	58:6,8	19,25
26:22	supported	59:19,22,	142:3
28:16	177:6	24,25	143:10
208:20	supporting	61:11,19	144:11,23
suggesting	60:19	62:14 67:7	145:14
78:16	supportive	68:8,17	146:2,3,15
108:21	177:16	70:19	147:4
227:5		110:19	150:5
		248:6	151:10

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: symposiums..ten

153:25	165:23	228:24	talks 27:3
154:7,12	talk 24:5,	229:13	29:18
157:22	8,20 25:9,	238:17,18	33:18
175:11	13 26:17	239:14,16,	34:4,21
177:6	27:18,21	20 244:21	35:2,10
178:7	29:12,13,	249:19	122:22
181:16	25 30:10,	250:22	201:9
204:13	21 31:2,8	253:20,24	239:14
224:10	32:23	256:9,11,	249:19
symposiums	33:20 34:7	14,15,25	257:8,25
144:8	35:25	257:3,16,	258:8,9
synonym	43:3,17	21,23	tape 257:1
100:18	63:15 79:9	258:4	taps 93:22
system 6:4,7	86:23 96:1	talked 38:22	targeted
90:11	115:5	54:17	244:10
92:24	129:4	122:14	taught 70:23
104:12	137:2	126:16,17	78:18 79:5
107:1,19	142:20	148:14	teach 71:13
249:9	145:13,22	191:2	72:3
257:19	146:3,18	248:23	teaching
systems	154:16	talking 43:4	22:7,9
95:12,14	174:8	64:4,13,16	120:12
	177:7	69:14	team 49:8
	187:20	75:23	128:24
T	190:21,24	79:22	technical
t-o-n 102:3	191:8	94:4,14	26:4,14
table 28:5	199:14	98:1 100:6	Ted 129:4
93:23	200:14	111:10	teeth 242:11
119:3,15	201:6,25	119:7,24	telling
191:1	207:11	122:20	109:24
197:11	209:10	158:21	225:3
252:7,8,10	212:3,8	168:2,10	tells 56:17
takes 168:12	213:6,10,	199:2	ten 55:24
224:21	13,18	203:6	
taking 11:3	215:4,5,	216:4	
143:23	12,18,21	220:25	
	216:6,7	226:13	
	227:19		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Index: ten-minute..theorists

92:3 139:9	72:25	115:6	textbooks
169:19	80:13 91:3	116:10	86:14
ten-minute	100:6	118:14	Thad 5:15
176:21	104:10	120:13	then-president
Tennessee	198:5	142:6,14	30:19
19:22	234:7	147:22	theoretical
tenure 20:1,	testified	149:22	107:4
11,18	6:12 43:15	151:3,5	213:1,20
80:21 81:3	111:15	152:15	Theoria
82:8,12	138:22	153:1,25	116:9
83:1,5,9,	152:5	161:20	117:19,25
20 84:8	160:3	162:25	118:10,12
123:23	169:9	179:14	119:8
124:8,10	182:19	180:1	120:5
197:25	183:8	181:8	125:13,16
235:10	197:12	187:21	128:2
236:17	206:20	188:25	theories
251:18	230:19	191:5	90:16 98:2
tenured	243:15	194:16	102:16
20:20 66:6	254:24	195:13	103:15
124:5	testify 10:1	196:15	106:18
197:24	156:1	199:10	107:20
198:1	testifying	233:21	114:13,15
Terence	155:2	Texas'	theorist
66:19	223:10	153:13	73:9 87:10
term 69:5,	testimony	Texas-austin	234:2,3,4,
6,7 70:5	8:18	34:19	5
84:5 89:7	118:25	53:11	theorists
93:4,5	145:2	text 99:8	55:15,25
214:14	189:24	211:5	56:16,20
243:15	197:17	256:20	58:10
terminal	255:2	257:7	88:25 89:7
23:2	256:12	textbook	96:1 97:6,
terms 21:4,9	Texas 6:4,7	85:22	13 98:4
31:5 54:10	76:7,24	86:1,7,18,	158:8
	77:2 78:3	21	182:15

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: theorized..things

246:3	65:6,8	119:11,17	theory's
theorized	66:14	120:8	24:17 28:6
57:25	67:4,13	122:17,22	39:10
theory 17:9	68:1,7,9,	124:12,20	92:20
19:17,25	11,16	127:15,18	107:9
23:5,13,	70:18,22	130:9,12,	169:23
16,21,24,	71:13,17	21 131:1	245:13
25 24:2,5,	72:2,8,20,	138:24	247:8
9 25:10,16	23 75:25	142:12	252:1
26:18	76:7	146:11	thesis
27:24 29:7	77:13,19,	157:21	248:3,5
30:19,25	21 78:14,	158:7,17,	thick 199:17
31:15	18 79:5,17	25 159:6	233:23
32:5,7	80:1 81:21	160:5,11	thin 68:24
33:1,9,16,	85:8,9,13,	161:14	thing 6:15
19,21	15,17,19,	164:20	34:3 44:19
34:5,6,18	23 86:1,9,	165:3	52:4 59:5
35:2,10	11,14,17,	168:3,9,23	119:24
36:16 39:1	18,21	169:3,11	136:19,23
42:11,16,	88:2,4,9,	170:20	166:9
22 43:18,	12 90:12	178:2	176:17
21 44:2,5,	91:4 92:6	186:3	182:9
8,21 45:25	95:2,3	190:25	184:2
47:4,11,15	96:5,7,19	195:3	187:3
48:16,17	97:2	201:10,24	207:20
49:1,7	102:13,19	210:4,7	210:19
50:14	103:7,24	229:3	230:25
51:6,24	104:7,9,12	233:24	239:12
53:6,10,20	105:21,23	234:1	246:4
54:12,19,	106:2,3	241:15	247:24
21,25	107:2,3,11	245:2,6	things 9:14
55:10,12,	108:2,7	246:19	44:4 49:3
13,15	110:19	247:19	51:19
56:2,18	111:13	248:2,10,	60:11
57:3,20	113:14	19 250:15	63:15
63:19,22,	114:2,4,13	251:9,18,	68:13
25 64:7,12	115:18	22 252:11	
	116:13,17	255:5	

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: thinking..timeline

81:15	140:18	tied	57:15	163:13,18,
98:20	141:17	Tim	202:19	23 164:25
107:6	146:14		203:25	169:1
140:23	150:23			172:21
146:14	183:14,16	time	5:7	174:16,19
147:2	189:1		6:17 7:23,	175:4,8
148:7,15,	190:11,13		24 9:25	176:13
19 155:1	196:13,17		13:12 16:1	184:24
169:15	197:13		17:4 25:6	188:25
176:15	207:11		26:7,11	190:15,19
189:20	227:15		29:20 31:8	192:25
195:20	240:16		32:5 33:6	194:16,17
200:11,13,			34:15	196:2
15 202:23	thought-		47:11,14	197:21
207:18	provoking		48:18	200:4,8
223:13	252:22		50:11,15	206:3,14,
227:7	thoughtful		51:3 54:6	16 207:16
235:25	252:23		60:7 62:14	214:2
237:2	thoughts		68:18	217:2
238:17	220:5		73:16	218:4
242:13			75:15,20	222:25
247:4,15	thousands		80:22	224:9
248:21	99:21,23		114:23	230:23
250:19,20	100:3		115:2,15	235:8,16
253:25	184:13,17		116:2	236:4
	246:23,24		120:9,13	237:14,22
thinking	threatened		124:1,8	239:23
96:6,24	235:9		130:5,15	240:16
255:12			134:22	244:1,5
Thomas	three-		135:3,9,22	249:18
233:21	125:2,7		136:8,10	253:7
234:2	three-fifths		137:4,23	254:6
	60:1,2,21		138:23	257:6
thought	three-week		139:19,20	258:19,21
28:14	138:8		140:8,11	
51:20 52:3			156:7	timeframe
102:21	thrown		157:11	230:20
134:2	145:20		159:20	timeline
136:11				

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: timely..translated

175:18	254:14,16,	247:8	114:3,13
221:9	20 255:7,	told 34:24	133:11
timely	13	67:20,23	tonic 105:19
230:12	title 24:8	143:2	top 218:4,
times 33:23	28:1 79:20	173:3	21 241:16,
102:6	119:10	191:8	17 248:11
213:23	165:2	201:6,7	topic 78:8
254:17	231:2	tomorrow	128:14
Timothy 5:4,	titled 27:19	217:15,16	132:16
16 32:11,	33:1 131:1	ton 102:3	tortoise
17 76:10	164:18	tonal 90:14,	100:13
104:3	titles 21:10	24 91:7	total 29:19
115:7	today 8:18	92:1,4,10,	touch 34:20
134:20	9:18 10:20	14,22 93:8	tough 163:7
136:6,17	11:23 42:3	97:6	traditional
137:6	68:14	102:19	44:14
142:15	73:16	103:24	traditions
153:5	74:14,22	105:2	96:20
158:14	86:9 92:19	107:19	transcribed
178:12,18	93:9	110:19	98:23
179:12,24	138:22	tonalities	transcript
180:1	145:2	95:18	259:1
181:14	148:22	tonality	transition
188:9	155:2	92:23	86:23
202:11,14,	165:11	95:9,22,25	115:4
16 203:17	169:9	96:7 104:9	transitioned
207:7	171:25	tone 102:1,	64:16,24
208:3,17	183:9	2,3,5	transitioning
216:14,17	189:25	106:9	18:10
217:24	204:25	tones 95:9	translated
218:11	230:19	104:7	98:24
219:20	243:16	106:3	234:6
227:14	247:24	107:11	
231:24	251:25	108:4	
236:9,11,	254:1	113:11	
13 237:5	today's 5:6		
240:5			

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: translation..uh-huh

translation	turn 38:9	typo 203:9	49:6,14,25
99:8 101:8	52:25 54:3		50:10,12,
	72:17	<u>u</u>	18,21,23
translations	131:4		51:5,12,18
99:5 101:9	133:18	U.S. 29:9	53:9,13,
travel 59:6	244:7	169:1	18,22,24
			54:8,15
traveled	turnaround	uh-huh 7:18	57:7 60:17
106:23	138:6,9	8:1,10	61:3 64:6,
		9:15	21,23
treated	turning	12:23,25	65:2,4
157:9,10	120:24	13:18,20,	67:2,9
triads 92:7	turns 119:24	22,25 14:9	74:10
trip 135:13	turtle	16:11	77:6,8,10
	100:13	17:2,7,17,	79:3,11
troubling		19 18:12,	87:8,24
212:21	tweets	22,24	88:16,22,
true 57:23	171:15	19:4,15,	24 90:25
98:5 108:1	twenty 65:22	18,23	91:24 93:2
149:25		20:21	94:11,16,
150:18	Twenty-two	21:11,24	19 95:8,
152:14	153:20	25:7,17	17,21
181:19	twin 58:5	27:2,12,23	96:10,13,
186:25		28:3,10,	15 97:21,
210:3	Twitter	13,22 29:5	25 98:12,
213:23	140:13,14,	30:15,23	17 103:16
223:11,13	16 171:21	31:13,19,	105:15
233:4	172:1	22 33:24	110:10
255:21,23	189:12,25	34:12,17,	114:6,8
	198:21	22 35:4,17	115:22
trumpeter	214:19	36:9,19	116:18
66:20		37:9 38:5	118:23
truth 11:6	two-year	40:14 41:8	119:4,9
	15:22	43:19,24	120:10,14,
truthfully	22:22 81:3	45:12,15,	21,25
10:19	type 129:1	18 46:9,23	121:6,23
Turkey 95:14	240:17	47:1,10,17	123:3,18,
	258:6	48:9,14,	24 124:4,
Turkish	Typical	20,24	
95:16	92:10		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Index: ultimately..understanding

23 127:6	20,23	243:8	72:15,18,
128:15	201:1	248:5	19
131:7,14	202:3,6,25	256:10	underpinnings
132:4	203:16,19,	ultimately	66:1,11
136:12,16	24 204:1,	17:5 19:21	understand
137:3,25	3,17	27:18	11:2,9,13
138:10,14	206:18,22	44:17,21	25:4 40:20
140:19	207:4,21,	51:9 73:3	47:22
142:13	24 208:5,	121:7	52:8,11
143:1,3	7,10,13	128:23	54:5,10
147:10	211:18,21,	147:6	71:11
148:12	23 212:6	170:19	72:10
158:11	213:8	un-tenured	78:22
159:19	214:13	236:21	83:16
161:16,24	215:13,17,	unacceptable	85:14,16
165:14	19 216:16	249:1,2	91:5 92:2
166:10,13,	218:9,24	unaware	98:21
15 167:23	219:8,15,	149:23	104:11
168:7	19 220:1,	unclear	110:2
170:15	3,9 221:2,	52:22	122:8
171:10	10,13	80:11	135:5
172:5,12,	223:3	211:8,9	140:5
19 177:14	224:5,7,	uncouple	155:4,8
179:4,20	15,18	108:7	156:15,17
180:20,25	225:12	113:14	157:8
181:17	227:24	uncourageous	169:16
182:3,5,8	228:6,7,	197:4	171:20
185:17	10,12,15	undergrad	196:1,11
188:18	229:12,22,	15:18	198:18
189:9,19	25 230:5	undergraduate	208:25
191:23	231:4,7,11	15:15	211:2
192:8,20	232:1,4	understandable	228:2
193:6,13,	233:2,9	74:12,22,	254:22
23,24	235:22	23 76:1	understanding
194:8	238:19	undergraduates	104:9
196:10	239:10,15,		
199:1,18,	18,21		
25 200:17,	241:21		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Index: understands..UNT2705

106:2	78:18 79:6	147:21	165:2
107:19	81:13	149:22	181:9
136:6	83:13 89:3	151:3	194:12
190:9	90:4 96:8	152:14,15,	218:7
207:16	106:24	25 153:13,	227:13,19,
understands	107:21	25 161:20	25 238:9
155:17	150:24	162:25	240:11,15
	168:11,17	179:13,25	253:11
understood	170:21	181:8	UNT02560
11:17	171:1,3	187:21	229:19
13:7,10,13	245:3,7	188:25	
90:15	246:16	191:4	UNT02645
181:10	248:8	194:15	180:16
201:18	249:13	195:13	UNT02658
uneasy	250:23	196:15	202:13
193:10,15	251:10	198:1	UNT02697
unequivocably	universe	199:9	223:20
61:12	146:14	221:1	
		233:21	UNT02705
unequivocally	university	234:3	208:9
103:20	6:3,7	238:10	UNT02707
uninformed	15:18,21	239:17	211:16
106:2	17:6 18:3	249:19	UNT02708
	19:22 20:8	252:19	216:13
uninterested	21:20,22	unpack 57:2,	UNT02758
176:1	22:14,16	4 68:20	218:3
Union 18:17	23:1 32:9	unpacking	UNT1146
United 16:14	34:19 44:9	255:15	238:3
29:8 54:25	47:16	unplugged	UNT2559
56:23	53:11	171:15	226:22
57:21,22	73:10	172:13	UNT2657
58:4,9	76:6,24	unreasonable	200:19
61:14	77:2,13	222:1	UNT2663
62:19 64:3	78:3 115:5	UNT 126:3	181:22
66:2,24	116:9,13	147:7	UNT2705
69:2,3,5,	118:14	164:18	
10 70:17,	120:13		
23 72:21	142:6,14		

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024 Index: UNT2758..vulnerable

207:25	vast 80:4	213:1,20	246:21,23
UNT2758	100:12	224:22	vis-à-vis
218:22	venue 128:17	viewed 22:25	50:19
untenured	verbatim	30:10	visa 18:13
124:7	43:11 54:5	viewing	visas 18:9
unusual	163:8	164:11	visit
128:8	256:22,24	viewpoints	194:12,15,
upcoming	Vermeer 18:4	242:15,17	19,20,24
14:15	version 28:7	254:21	195:7,23
17:24	vetting	views	199:9,12
217:11	124:18	131:17,18	voice 90:7,
upholding	vib- 95:6	132:10	9,19
68:17	vibrating	242:21	volume
70:18	95:6	250:6	117:19,25
upholds	vice 241:2,	vigorously	136:24
160:13	11	80:23	137:1,10,
upstate	victorious	violated	17 139:2
172:14	51:10	163:12,15	140:2
USSR 17:18	video 60:10	violinist	142:16
utilizes	258:18	65:19	158:13
208:21	Vienna	virtual	162:8,22
utter 92:1	87:14,21,	215:18,21	182:23
	25	238:18	183:11,22
<hr/>		virtually	195:19
v	view 54:18	43:11	221:14
	59:14	55:23	224:9,10,
valid 96:24	61:19	88:11	20 235:17
valued 56:24	132:10	100:15	240:1
van 92:12	133:10	163:17	242:1
Vancouver	151:7	164:12	volumes
115:17,24	152:17	215:8	98:16
116:19,24	161:12	238:20	vulnerability
vary 106:7	162:1,5,9	246:3	197:20
	177:6	virulently	vulnerable
	204:7		236:7

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: wage..white

	226:14	waves 93:18	68:16,19
W	229:2	ways 55:13	70:5
	238:23,25	73:22 92:1	Wettrennen
wage 81:4	239:1,13	96:24	101:1
wait 88:9	253:16	97:24	whatsoever
138:7	Walls'	170:17	232:6
203:10	217:23	weak 196:25	Wheeldon
232:11	Walton 5:21	website	34:16 35:9
walk 196:22	180:3,5,10	30:16	36:11
248:12	206:5,10	31:18	257:6
walks 198:1	226:9	142:25	white 24:9,
Wall 238:25	243:21	147:22	17 27:25
Walls	244:6,14	153:13,17	28:6 33:2
185:15,19,	247:21	159:1,5	44:21 47:4
22 186:9	252:4	week 19:8	48:16
187:24	254:3	25:1	54:11,13,
188:3,13	255:25	209:10	16,20,22,
189:6	258:15,20,	212:3,4	24 55:3,5,
190:7,10	25	weekly	9,11,21
196:18	Walton's	217:15	56:1,7,14,
202:14	254:25	weeks 212:4	20 57:16,
204:21	wanted 9:4	252:18	19,22,24
205:19,21	18:7 25:15	weigh 169:19	58:6,7,16,
206:19	27:20	Weisse 88:15	25 59:15,
208:2	63:15,19	welcomed	19,21,23,
209:13,23	65:6 72:20	255:3,7	24 61:2,5,
210:2,11	82:1	Welcoming	7,10,19
212:5,11	119:23	49:2	62:13,14
214:3,21	142:18	Wes- 70:16	63:2 64:5,
215:5,11	143:19	West 68:22,	11,18,20
216:5,15	186:17	24 69:7,	65:5,7,12,
217:4	War 62:22	13,22	24 66:10
218:11,23	watching	Western	67:5,21
219:14	30:21		68:16,17
221:11,20	water 61:16		69:24
223:2,16			70:16,17,
224:19			19,21

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: whiteness..work

71:17	who'd	16:24	13:19	45:13
72:7,22	widest		Wolfgang	46:11,12,
77:19,21,	160:20		92:13	13 57:18
24 78:7,	Wiener		woman	59:20 69:3
11,13,17	225:14,15,		women	81:24
79:5,19	19		wondering	89:17
80:1 81:9	wife	14:17,	220:4	95:23
83:3 88:4	20 172:14		244:23	108:13,14,
90:2,10,	Wikipedia		word	25 109:23,
13,18	127:25		36:21	25 110:3
92:21,22	128:3,9		59:16,17	125:2,7
107:9,21,	129:7,8,10		64:18	135:13
25 127:15			68:19	149:8
130:10	willful		83:21,22	189:21
131:2	212:20		84:1 85:5	work
168:3,18,	William		89:15	16:25
24 169:2,	108:14		95:24 96:4	22:23
10,23	110:25		97:3	27:17
170:13,24	131:13		100:1,10,	28:8,14
174:3,9	132:25		23 101:1	43:23 50:6
245:10,13	window		102:1,2,5	52:16
247:8	140:11		149:7	57:13
248:6,15	windows		150:14	78:10
251:7,17,	215:22		154:22	81:13 87:6
25 252:7,	winter		155:15	100:4
13,21	137:24		156:15	102:7
253:2	224:23		157:5,8	103:20,24
254:15,19,	232:17,25		175:3,8	109:8
25 255:3,			234:24	110:12
22 257:19	Winter/spring		235:23	121:4,11
whiteness	44:22		246:22	135:14
56:4,5,8,	wires	135:13	255:14	183:20,21
24 57:8,9	withheld		256:16	186:19
60:19	37:5		257:7,20	210:4
107:23	witnesses		258:2	214:4,7
173:8			words	223:2
174:13			9:19	224:19
257:18			44:13,19	233:23
				234:9

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: worked..Youtube

255:8	67:24	108:21	117:3
worked	108:24	111:8	194:21
120:23	109:25	128:16	years 16:22
178:16	230:9	130:10	20:4 23:9
201:14	234:4	141:21	55:24
209:13	writer 98:11	163:10	56:10,22
256:13	writes	187:16	57:14 59:7
working 35:9	203:17,25	wrong 41:11	65:18,22
120:18	212:11	227:16	66:8,18
188:16	217:8	wrote 44:13,	73:10 78:4
206:20	219:24	16,17,22	92:3
219:25	225:22	48:23 59:1	107:1,5,18
233:19	writing 44:6	61:5 85:14	122:24,25
workings	58:17 59:8	109:23	136:14,15,
181:15	85:22	110:8	20 140:15
works 49:16	125:1	137:20	153:20
55:16	132:6	143:4	169:20
83:16	139:8	153:6	183:17
98:14,16	215:11	171:5	245:25
104:15	241:9	174:7	247:6
107:21	writings	177:15	252:14
124:2	99:13,24	201:21	years-plus
world 67:14	131:16	214:1	155:23
95:11	132:8	252:18	York 6:11
97:20	246:10,11,	253:25	15:22 20:8
129:12	12,13		21:20,22
213:1,20	251:14	Y	22:14,17
worth 83:11	written 7:8	Yale 17:6	23:1,13
102:23	54:16	19:16	65:14,21
161:13	57:19	238:10,17	66:4,14
wrap 226:8	59:15,21,	239:16	67:10
Wright 5:4	24 61:10	Ye- 133:7	254:17
writ 66:13	62:20	year 20:14	Youtube
write 44:10	66:17 78:8	48:25	30:13
	79:8 92:5	68:21	128:21
	105:5	80:25	129:1

TIMOTHY JACKSON vs LAURA WRIGHT, ET AL.

Dr. Philip Adrian Ewell on 09/19/2024

Index: Yup..Zooming

Yup 11:4,7,
19 49:21
120:17

Z

Zoom 215:22
216:3

Zooming
252:15